

CIVIL DISTRICT COURT  
PARISH OF ORLEANS  
STATE OF LOUISIANA

GLORIA SCOTT AND \*  
DEANIA JACKSON \*  
\* NO. 96-8461  
VERSUS \* DIVISION "I"  
\* SECTION 14  
THE AMERICAN TOBACCO \*  
COMPANY, INC., ET AL. \*  
\*  
\* \* \* \* \*

Transcript of proceedings before The  
Honorable Richard J. Ganucheau, Judge Pro Tempore,  
Civil District Court, Parish of Orleans, State of  
Louisiana, 421 Loyola Avenue, New Orleans, Louisiana  
70112, commencing on June 18, 2001.

\* \* \* \* \*  
Tuesday  
April 29, 2003  
1:14 p.m.  
\* \* \* \* \*

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19174

## APPEARANCES:

GAUTHIER, DOWNING, LaBARRE, BEISER  
AND DEAN  
Attorneys at Law  
(By: Deborah M. Sulzer, Esquire)  
3500 North Hullen Street  
Metairie, Louisiana 70002  
- AND -  
HERMAN, HERMAN, KATZ AND COTLAR, L.L.P.  
Attorneys at Law  
(By: Russ M. Herman, Esquire)  
820 O'Keefe Avenue  
New Orleans, Louisiana 70113  
- AND -  
BRUNO AND BRUNO  
Attorneys at Law  
(By: Joseph M. Bruno, Esquire)  
825 Baronne Street  
New Orleans, Louisiana 70113  
- AND -  
CARTER & CATES  
(By: Kenneth M. Carter, Esquire)  
Attorneys at Law  
Suite 1230, Energy Centre  
1100 Poydras Street  
New Orleans, Louisiana 70163-1230

18

- AND -

19

GERTLER, GERTLER, VINCENT AND PLOTKIN, L.L.P.  
Attorneys at Law  
(By: Michael H. Gertler, Esquire)  
127-129 Carondelet Street  
New Orleans, Louisiana 70130

22

- AND -

23

MURRAY LAW FIRM, APLC  
Attorneys at Law  
(By: Stephen B. Murray, Esquire)  
Suite 2550  
909 Poydras Street  
New Orleans, Louisiana 70112

26

27

- AND -

28

BENCOMO AND ASSOCIATES  
Attorneys at Law  
(By: Raul R. Bencomo, Esquire)  
Suite 2110, One Poydras Plaza  
639 Loyola Avenue  
New Orleans, Louisiana 70113

29

30

31

- AND -

32

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753  
19175

1

W. JAMES SINGLETON, ESQUIRE  
4050 Linwood Avenue  
Shreveport, Louisiana 71108-2432  
(Attorneys for the Plaintiffs)

2

3

4

JONES DAY  
Attorneys at Law  
(By: Mark A. Belasic, Esquire)  
North Point  
901 Lakeside Avenue  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-1190

5

6

7

- AND -

8

STONE PIGMAN WALTHER WITTMANN, L.L.C.  
Attorneys at Law  
(By: Phillip A. Wittmann, Esquire)  
546 Carondelet Street  
New Orleans, Louisiana 70130  
(Attorneys for the Defendant,  
R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Company)

10

11

12

13

KING AND SPALDING  
Attorneys at Law  
(By: Richard A. Schneider, Esquire  
Jack Williams, Esquire)  
191 Peachtree Street  
Atlanta, Georgia 30303-1763  
(Attorneys for the Defendant,  
Brown and Williamson Tobacco  
Corporation, individually and  
as successor by merger to  
The American Tobacco Company)

14

15

16

17

18

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

ADAMS AND REESE, L.L.P.  
Attorneys at Law  
(By: Charles F. Gay, Jr., Esquire  
Ronald J. Sholes, Esquire)  
Suite 4500, One Shell Square  
701 Poydras Street  
New Orleans, Louisiana 70139  
(Attorneys for the Defendant,  
Philip Morris, Incorporated)

SHOOK, HARDY AND BACON, L.L.P.  
Attorneys at Law  
(By: Gary R. Long, Esquire  
Tammy B. Coker, Esquire)  
One Kansas City Place  
1200 Main Street  
Kansas City, Missouri 64105-2118  
- AND -

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19176

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7

GORDON, ARATA, McCOLLAM, DUPLANTIS  
AND EGAN, L.L.P.  
Attorneys at Law  
(By: Steven W. Copley, Esquire)  
Suite 4000  
201 St. Charles Avenue  
New Orleans, Louisiana 70170-4000  
(Attorneys for the Defendant,  
Lorillard Tobacco Company)

SPECIAL MASTER:

8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14

Dominic J. Gianna, Esquire  
Middleberg, Riddle and Gianna  
Suite 3100  
201 St. Charles Avenue  
New Orleans, Louisiana 70170-3100

REPORTED BY:

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

Carol Vallette Slater  
Certified Court Reporter  
Register Professional Reporter  
(No. 78020)  
Huffman & Robinson, Inc.  
Suite 250 Annex  
701 Poydras Street  
New Orleans, Louisiana 70139  
(504) 525-1753 (800) 749-1753

\* \* \* \* \*

21  
22  
23

24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753  
19177

1 I N D E X

2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

WITNESS:	PAGE
ROBERT J. NORRELL, Ph.D.	
REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. SHOLES.....	19188
PETER P. ROWELL, Ph.D.	
DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. SCHNEIDER.....	19193
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. BRUNO.....	19220
RE-DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. SCHNEIDER.....	19258

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753  
19178

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 THE COURT:  
3 Recess is over.  
4 When the luncheon recess started, I  
5 indicated that we would resume a little early in  
6 order for me to hear some arguments on the  
7 objections to some demonstrative aids that the  
8 defendants are planning to use in connection with  
9 the redirect of Dr. Norrell. Mr. Sholes attempted  
10 to talk, I asked him to --  
11 MR. SHOLES:  
12 May I interrupt, for a moment, Your  
13 Honor. I noticed Mr. Belasic wanted to weigh  
14 in on this issue, also. They have not been  
15 brought back yet. He is on his way. If the  
16 Court will indulge us for a couple minutes

17 just for him to get here.  
18 THE COURT:  
19 We will wait a couple minutes.  
20 MR. SHOLES:  
21 Thank you, Your Honor.  
22 MR. RUSS HERMAN:  
23 Have you given the Judge a copy of this  
24 transcript?  
25 MR. SHOLES:  
26 Of course.  
27 (Whereupon, a discussion was held  
28 off the record.)  
29 THE COURT:  
30 Mr. Sholes?  
31 MR. SHOLES:  
32 Yes, Your Honor. I understand.

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19179

1 THE COURT:  
2 I said 1:15, and it's now nearly 1:25.  
3 MR. SHOLES:  
4 I understand, Your Honor.  
5 THE COURT:  
6 We're going to begin.  
7 Mr. Sholes, you were saying, as we  
8 recessed for lunch.  
9 MR. SHOLES:  
10 Judge, there were attempts to point out  
11 to the Court that it has happened in the  
12 past, as a matter of fact, with the very  
13 first witness, where plaintiffs provided to  
14 us right before the witness took the stand on  
15 redirect his redirect demonstrative exhibits.  
16 There was a colloquy before the Court, Mr.  
17 Herman and Mr. Belasic about the fact that we  
18 had not seen them and, as a matter of fact,  
19 some of these were things not even on an  
20 exhibit list.  
21 THE COURT:  
22 Is that in the transcript you gave me of  
23 January 29?  
24 MR. SHOLES:  
25 I believe it is, Your Honor. I believe  
26 we highlighted those sections. We gave those  
27 to Mr. Herman before we gave it to the court.  
28 THE COURT:  
29 And I have something on Page 12,119.  
30 MR. SHOLES:  
31 There's several pages of comments  
32 from --

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19180

1 THE COURT:  
2 Well, I'm looking at the first one,  
3 12,119.  
4 MR. SHOLES:  
5 Yes.  
6 THE COURT:  
7 If you're looking at a different page,  
8 give me the number.  
9 MR. SHOLES:

10 I'm looking at 12,119. What the Court  
11 indicated that there was no preinstruction on  
12 redirect exhibits.  
13 THE COURT:  
14 Well, let's look at that. I didn't --  
15 have I indicated that there's some  
16 instruction on redirect exhibits today?  
17 MR. SHOLES:  
18 No, Your Honor.  
19 THE COURT:  
20 Okay.  
21 MR. SHOLES:  
22 But redirect exhibits have never been  
23 covered by any of the pretrial orders.  
24 THE COURT:  
25 I think we concede that.  
26 MR. SHOLES:  
27 Now, in that testimony with Dr. Burns,  
28 Mr. Herman, before Dr. Burns took the stand,  
29 I believe, handed to us his redirect  
30 exhibits. We'd never seen them and had quite  
31 a bit of -- as a matter of fact, redirect had  
32 already begun when he gave us the exhibits.

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19181

1 We never had an opportunity to review them.  
2 And they were not identified with Dr. Burns.  
3 Mr. Belasic objected.

4 THE COURT:  
5 And where is that?

6 MR. SHOLES:  
7 I think you're going to find that on  
8 12,132, and highlighted there, Mr. Belasic  
9 commented the very first objection, this is  
10 not on any exhibit list since it was just  
11 created last night and given to us, and  
12 that's the first objection.

13 And if the Court would indulge us by  
14 going to 12,135 --

15 THE COURT:  
16 I'm there.

17 MR. SHOLES:  
18 Mr. Belasic indicates at the bottom of  
19 that page, we won't object as long as we're  
20 given the same leeway, as long as Mr. Herman  
21 doesn't hassle us, we will withdraw our  
22 objection, and that's why we proceeded that  
23 way.

24 Further, on the next page, Page 12,136,  
25 Mr. Belasic indicates if you're going to let  
26 their experts do it, I'm going to want my  
27 medical experts to come in and we're going to  
28 have a battle over these pre-prepared charts  
29 instead of actual testimony. If he can get  
30 his in, I can make one of my own, correct?

31 And the court says the same rulings  
32 apply to both defendants, plaintiffs and

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19182

1 defendants. The rules don't change when you  
2 change sides.

3 Our contention is they were allowed to  
4 give us stuff that was not on Dr. Burns'  
5 exhibit list that he had just created  
6 demonstratives that were used on his redirect  
7 that we had not seen. They were allowed to  
8 do it. We believe, Your Honor, with all due  
9 respect, we should be allowed to do it.

10 THE COURT:

11 You think what I referred to on Page  
12 12,135 at Lines 10 and 11, this is a summary  
13 and chart -- summary or calculation -- I  
14 think that fits the article -- is a  
15 demonstrative and not an exhibit?

16 MR. SHOLES:

17 I believe that is correct, Your Honor.  
18 It was definitely a demonstrative. Let me be  
19 sure.

20 MR. RUSS HERMAN:

21 Of course, there's a lot not underlined,  
22 and I'll try to be as succinct as I can. I  
23 offered it at Page 12,131 a summary exhibit  
24 under Louisiana Code of Evidence 1006. It  
25 was not offered as a demonstrative. It was  
26 offered as a summary document based on  
27 various medical journals.

28 If you look at the bottom of 12,013, the  
29 part that's not underlined, Mr. Belasic says  
30 the more important objection is the documents  
31 he's talking about here were put into  
32 evidence by me. They were already in

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19183

1 evidence by Mr. Belasic. So, there was  
2 nothing wrong with making a summary exhibit  
3 according to the code by documents which  
4 everyone had notice and were actually used.

5 If you look then at Page 12,133, two  
6 things occur that are not underlined. Number  
7 1, I say they gave me the articles from which  
8 1006 were made. I got them from the  
9 defendants.

10 THE COURT:

11 What line are you on, please?

12 MR. RUSS HERMAN:

13 At Line 17 and 16. They gave me every  
14 one of those.

15 THE COURT:

16 If you're on Page --

17 MR. RUSS HERMAN:

18 12,134. I'm at Page 12,134 now.

19 THE COURT:

20 Line 17.

21 MR. RUSS HERMAN:

22 They certainly knew about them, meaning  
23 Mr. Belasic, because they gave these to me.  
24 They gave me every one of these articles  
25 yesterday to be used on their cross-  
26 examination.

27 Then, Your Honor says, and this isn't  
28 underlined, I have the article in front of  
29 me. That is, Code of Evidence 1006. All I  
30 did was offer a 1006 in evidence. It wasn't

31 demonstrative. It was evidence. Then, Mr.  
32 Belasic, unfortunately, contrary to learned  
HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19184

1 Counsel's argument that 12,136, Page 12,136,  
2 he says he understands Your Honor's ruling  
3 that this goes in, and I'm going to want my  
4 medical experts to come in so he can do the  
5 same thing. In other words, if their medical  
6 journal article's used by us on cross-  
7 examination, he's going to want the right to  
8 issue a 1006 summary exhibit.

9 Now, to say that this transcends or is  
10 contrary to a CMO directed at demonstrative  
11 evidence completely off the issue and have  
12 the defendants make an exhaustive search of  
13 January, February, March and April and come  
14 up with only this text, we believe, doesn't  
15 support learned Counsel's argument  
16 whatsoever. It's clear we never got the  
17 documents, we didn't have time to object to  
18 them, and they were never served on us and  
19 that they are demonstratives. They're listed  
20 as demonstratives.

21 THE COURT:  
22 Anything, Mr. Sholes?

23 MR. SHOLES:  
24 First, to call it an exhaustive search  
25 and we only had a short time, this was the  
26 one quick ready one we could find. It was  
27 not on his exhibit list on his reliance list.

28 THE COURT:  
29 But it apparently seems to be sanctioned  
30 by 1006, or the evidence article you cited?

31 MR. RUSS HERMAN:  
32 Yes, 1006. It's in evidence -- is the  
HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19185

1 article on evidence that says you can --

2 MR. SHOLES:  
3 It's clearly a demonstrative that we  
4 were not aware of, they had not produced to  
5 us, and I think the Court will agree, I think  
6 it's true, that other times we've tried to  
7 use 1006 -- let me back that up before I say  
8 that, but I'm fairly certain.

9 THE COURT:  
10 Well, Mr. Sholes, again, I'm not going  
11 to try to refresh my memory on those fine  
12 points, but 1006 deals with summaries, and I  
13 was referring to that article because I quote  
14 part of it here. The issue before me is  
15 demonstrative aids and Trial Order Number 5  
16 is very specific. It was not complied with.  
17 To the extent it was not complied with, those  
18 demonstrative aids will not be used at this  
19 trial.

20 Get the jury, please.

21 THE LAW CLERK:

22 Yes, Judge.

23 THE COURT:



24                   While we're waiting for the jury, has  
25                   there been any change in the work schedule of  
26                   May 5 to May 9?

27                   MR. BELASIC:

28                   We can agree to move the schedule. Dr.  
29                   Townsend won't be available to testify until  
30                   Monday at 1:30. We will determine what we  
31                   will do to fill the morning in. Perhaps we  
32                   may have to have a hearing on demonstratives,

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana                   (504) 525-1753

19186

1                   hopefully not, but we will certainly agree to  
2                   the jury's request.

3                   THE COURT:

4                   I will instruct the jury then that we  
5                   will take testimony before them on May 5,  
6                   Monday, which was scheduled as a jury off  
7                   day, and the jury will be off on Friday, May  
8                   9th of that same week, which will be a  
9                   change. I will send a memorandum around to  
10                  everyone setting that out. All right. Thank  
11                  you.

12                  MR. SHOLES:

13                  Your Honor, if I may, can I get  
14                  clarification on one point?

15                  THE COURT:

16                  Mr. Sholes?

17                  MR. SHOLES:

18                  Are we now allowed to use exhibits that  
19                  were -- that are on the exhibit list with Dr.  
20                  Norrell?

21                  THE COURT:

22                  My understanding is that as to redirect  
23                  exhibits, my orders are silent, and I made a  
24                  comment earlier that the next tobacco class  
25                  action will be a little better than this one,  
26                  but I have no prohibition against using them  
27                  as long as they were previously listed and  
28                  noted to the other side. But there is a  
29                  specific provision for demonstratives, and  
30                  that's what I'm relying on for my last  
31                  ruling.

32                  MR. SHOLES:

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana                   (504) 525-1753

19187

1                   I'd like to point out to Counsel at this  
2                   point we will attempt to introduce the  
3                   exhibits which covers the PSA.

4                   MR. RUSS HERMAN:

5                   PSAs?

6                   MR. SHOLES:

7                   Public service announcements.

8                   MR. RUSS HERMAN:

9                   Your Honor, if there are some witnesses  
10                  in the courtroom, we'd like them identified,  
11                  because if they're not experts, we want them  
12                  sequestered.

13                  MR. SHOLES:

14                  Everyone in the courtroom is an expert  
15                  witness that we would call.

16                  MR. RUSS HERMAN:

17 We would like them identified.  
18 THE COURT:  
19 Anyone in the room who would expect to  
20 be called as a witness, raise your hand.  
21 THE COURT:  
22 Your name, sir?  
23 MR. ROWELL:  
24 Peter Rowell.  
25 THE COURT:  
26 Anyone else?  
27 MR. SHOLES:  
28 Your Honor, while we're waiting for the  
29 jury, the exhibits that we're going to try to  
30 introduce are the --  
31 THE COURT:  
32 Mr. Herman is not listening to you.

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19188

1 Maybe it would be better if he and Mr. Herman  
2 were listening.  
3 Would you start again?  
4 THE CLERK:  
5 All rise for the jury, please.  
6 (Jury seated.)  
7 THE COURT:  
8 Please be seated.  
9 Mr. Sholes?  
10 MR. SHOLES:  
11 Good afternoon.

12 REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. SHOLES:

13 Q. Professor Norrell, earlier, Mr. Murray asked  
14 you about a bunch of things. He went through a  
15 litany of things and asked you if those things were  
16 changed since the filing of this lawsuit. Do you  
17 know whether or not those things that had -- being  
18 changed or being done had anything whatsoever to do  
19 with the filing of this lawsuit?

20 A. They did not have anything to do with the  
21 filing of this lawsuit.

22 Q. Now, sir, he also asked you about some  
23 advertisements and it's correct that there were  
24 other things that were out there being told to the  
25 public on TV other than just tobacco company  
26 advertisements; is that correct?

27 A. Yes, sir. Public service announcements ran  
28 on television, of course, in the 1960s, and then the  
29 public service announcements have continued even  
30 though the television advertisements of cigarettes  
31 stopped in 1972.

32 Q. Sir, is it correct that you reviewed Exhibit  
HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19189

1 SA-4113, and is that a compilation of some of the  
2 public service announcements that were run on TV?

3 A. Yes, it is.

4 MR. SHOLES:

5 Your Honor, at this time, we would like  
6 to move to introduce SA-4113.

7 THE COURT:

8 Objection?

9 MR. STEPHEN MURRAY:

10 Yes, Your Honor. May we approach.  
11 (Whereupon, a sidebar conference is held  
12 as follows:)  
13 MR. STEPHEN MURRAY:  
14 Your Honor, that exhibit is not on any  
15 list that has been provided to us.  
16 MR. SHOLES:  
17 If it's on our exhibit list -- it was  
18 not listed as a specific exhibit with this  
19 witness, but it is on our exhibit list and  
20 the rule is that for purposes of redirect, it  
21 does not have to be listed. We only want to  
22 play a portion of these. We only want to  
23 play three of them, which are the three that  
24 you have already seen on that previously  
25 submitted demonstrative.  
26 MR. STEPHEN MURRAY:  
27 Are they on his reliance list?  
28 MR. SHOLES:  
29 Exhibits do not -- on redirect do not  
30 have to be on the reliance list.  
31 THE COURT:  
32 Well, the trial orders are silent on

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19190

1 that issue. That's the problem. If it's on  
2 the exhibit list -- are you saying that they  
3 were used in past?  
4 MR. SHOLES:  
5 No. I'm saying that they are on the  
6 exhibit list.  
7 THE COURT:  
8 You said something about you used four  
9 of them --  
10 MR. SHOLES:  
11 The compilation has 28. We only want to  
12 use three of them, and those three we gave  
13 him on that list of demonstratives we gave  
14 them that you've seen.  
15 MR. STEPHEN MURRAY:  
16 Now you're going to ask him about 28 of  
17 them, and I have no way to know --  
18 MR. SHOLES:  
19 You have the three we want to show.  
20 MR. STEPHEN MURRAY:  
21 What?  
22 MR. SHOLES:  
23 You have the three on that demonstrative  
24 that we're going to show.  
25 MR. STEPHEN MURRAY:  
26 You going to ask him about the three or  
27 about the 28?  
28 MR. SHOLES:  
29 I'm only going to ask him about the  
30 three.  
31 THE COURT:  
32 Are they on the demonstrative list?

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19191

1 Well, let's look at the demonstrative list.  
2 And how are they identified, Mr. Sholes?

3 MR. SHOLES:  
4 Tammy, give me the demonstrative number,  
5 please.  
6 MS. COKER:  
7 1082.  
8 MR. RUSS HERMAN:  
9 I can help, Mr. Sholes.  
10 MR. RUSS HERMAN:  
11 Mr. Sholes, here's the list.  
12 MR. SHOLES:  
13 Here we go.  
14 Thank you, Mr. Herman.  
15 MR. RUSS HERMAN:  
16 You're welcome.  
17 MR. STEPHEN MURRAY:  
18 Submitted.  
19 THE COURT:  
20 Overruled.  
21 (End of sidebar.)  
22 EXAMINATION BY MR. SHOLES:  
23 Q. Professor Norrell, do these public service  
24 announcements -- illustrative of what else was out  
25 there available to the public and being shown to the  
26 public on smoking and health?  
27 A. Yes, sir.  
28 Q. Were they running back in the '70s and  
29 continuing to run throughout time?  
30 A. Yes, sir. They began in the '60s and they  
31 continued through in various forms today.  
32 MR. SHOLES:  
HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753  
19192  
1 Your Honor, at this time, we'd move to  
2 public an excerpt of SA-4113.  
3 THE COURT:  
4 I've heard the arguments and the  
5 objections and it is overruled.  
6 You may publish.  
7 MR. SHOLES:  
8 May we turn the lights down?  
9 MR. SHOLES:  
10 Proceed, Bert.  
11 (Whereupon, demonstratives are shown to  
12 the jury.)  
13 MR. SHOLES:  
14 May we have the lights back on?  
15 Your Honor, we have no further  
16 questions.  
17 THE COURT:  
18 Step down.  
19 Next witness for the defense?  
20 MR. SCHNEIDER:  
21 Your Honor, defense calls Dr. Peter  
22 Rowell.  
23 THE COURT:  
24 I presume this witness is discharged?  
25 You may leave, Doctor. Thank you.  
26 Step up to be sworn, please.  
27 PETER P. ROWELL, Ph.D.,  
28 after being first duly sworn by the Clerk,  
29 testified as follows:  
30 THE COURT:

31 Have a seat, Doctor. That microphone is  
32 turned on. If you speak into it, everybody  
HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19193

1 can hear you, you won't have to raise your  
2 voice.  
3 Mr. Schneider, ready to proceed?  
4 MR. SCHNEIDER:  
5 Yes, Your Honor.  
6 Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen.  
7 Good afternoon, Your Honor, Counsel.  
8 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. SCHNEIDER:  
9 Q. Good afternoon, Dr. Rowell?  
10 A. Good afternoon.  
11 Q. Let's get you to formally introduce yourself  
12 to the jury.  
13 A. My name is Peter Rowell. I'm a professor of  
14 pharmacology at the University of Louisville.  
15 Q. Are you here, Dr. Rowell, to offer opinions  
16 in the area of nicotine pharmacology?  
17 A. Yes, I am.  
18 Q. Have you published peer-reviewed articles in  
19 the field of nicotine pharmacology?  
20 A. Yes, I have.  
21 Q. And have your articles been cited by the  
22 United States Surgeon General?  
23 A. Yes.  
24 Q. All right. Let's go and try to find out a  
25 little bit about your background and your  
26 qualifications. Tell the jury, where do you work,  
27 Doctor?  
28 A. I work in Louisville, Kentucky, at the School  
29 of Medicine, in the Department of Pharmacology.  
30 Q. So, you and your family reside in Louisville  
31 and you came down to testify here in this case at  
32 New Orleans?

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19194

1 A. That's right.  
2 Q. What is your current position at the  
3 University of Louisville, School of Medicine?  
4 A. I am a full professor. My current position  
5 is a professor of neuropharmacology, which is a  
6 subset of pharmacology, and also assistant for  
7 research at the School of Medicine.  
8 Q. How long have you been at the University of  
9 Louisville School of Medicine?  
10 A. A little over 25 years.  
11 Q. And what do you do there? I take it you  
12 teach?  
13 A. Yes, I do. I teach. I teach the medical  
14 students and, also, dental students and nursing  
15 students and other students. Also graduate  
16 students. I do mainly research. I run a research  
17 lab involved in the study of nicotine, and I do  
18 administrative work for the dean and the School of  
19 Medicine in general.  
20 Q. So, your teaching is -- of the students of  
21 the School of Medicine there who are hoping to go on  
22 to become doctors?  
23 A. That's correct.

24 Q. Can you estimate for us over your 25 years  
25 how many doctors have you had the benefit of  
26 teaching pharmacology?  
27 A. Between 2,000 -- it's over 2,000 medical  
28 students.  
29 Q. You say you also research?  
30 A. Correct.  
31 Q. Now, research is doing laboratory  
32 experiments?  
HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753  
19195

1 A. Yes. These are laboratory experiments.  
2 Q. Is research also reading scientific  
3 literature and determining what scientists have  
4 found and published?  
5 A. Absolutely.  
6 Q. How much of your time do you spend doing  
7 laboratory research?  
8 A. About half my time, or maybe a little over,  
9 55 percent.  
10 Q. Okay. Let's go a little bit further back in  
11 time, and tell us where you grew up. We don't need  
12 to hear a David Copperfield type of stuff, but tell  
13 us where you grew up and your educational  
14 background.  
15 A. I'm originally from St. Petersburg, Florida,  
16 and I grew up in Florida. I went to high school  
17 there and then went to Stetson University for my  
18 undergraduate degree in DeLand, Florida.  
19 Q. What was that degree in?  
20 A. I got a degree in psychology and a minor in  
21 chemistry at Stetson.  
22 Q. And what year was that?  
23 A. That was in 1968.  
24 Q. And after you got that degree in psychology,  
25 did you continue your schoolwork right at that  
26 point?  
27 A. Not exactly at that point.  
28 Q. What happened?  
29 A. Well, that was the Vietnam war era. So, I  
30 was inducted into the Army in 1969 and spent two  
31 years in the armed services, in the Army.  
32 Q. What positions did you hold, what rank did  
HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753  
19196

1 you hold in the armed services?  
2 A. Well, my first rank was a second lieutenant  
3 and I was first at Fort Sam Houston, Texas, and then  
4 later on in a M.A.S.H. unit in Fort Meade, Maryland.  
5 The last year, I was sent to Vietnam and I was a  
6 first lieutenant with the 101st Airborne Division in  
7 an infantry battalion.  
8 Q. When you were in Viet Nam, were you working  
9 in a M.A.S.H. unit or out in the field in combat?  
10 A. I was a little further out in the field than  
11 that. It was at a fire base with an infantry  
12 battalion.  
13 Q. Did you eventually get out of the service?  
14 A. Yes.  
15 Q. What year was that?  
16 A. 1971.

17 Q. When you left the military, did you receive  
18 any awards?  
19 A. Yes.  
20 Q. What were those?  
21 A. I received the Bronze Star in 1971, also the  
22 Combat Infantry badge and the Air Medal for air  
23 operations.  
24 Q. Having served your country, you came back to  
25 the United States and pursued your education  
26 further?  
27 A. Correct.  
28 Q. Where did you go to school?  
29 A. Pursued graduate work at the University of  
30 Florida, Gainesville, Florida, and entered the  
31 College of Medicine, School of Medicine there, in  
32 the field of pharmacology.

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19197

1 Q. Did you ultimately receive a Ph.D.?  
2 A. Yes.  
3 Q. That's a doctor of philosophy in a field of  
4 science?  
5 A. Right.  
6 Q. In what field?  
7 A. Research degree in the field of pharmacology.  
8 Q. And I think the jury may know what the field  
9 of pharmacology is because we've heard a great  
10 number of witnesses in this case, but remind us all.  
11 What is pharmacology?  
12 A. Okay. Pharmacology is the study of how drugs  
13 work in the body. It's not pharmacy, which is  
14 dispensing and compounding drugs and putting them  
15 into the body. Once it gets into the bloodstream,  
16 it goes to whatever organ it is, it's kind of the  
17 molecular action of how drugs work, how they  
18 interact with the body and what they do.  
19 Q. All right. When you were in graduate school  
20 at the University of Florida, what was the focus of  
21 your work and your research there?  
22 A. It was on how drugs work in the nervous  
23 system, particularly drugs that work on a subset of  
24 nerves called the acetylcholine nerves, or  
25 cholinergic nerves. I included nicotine in that  
26 work.  
27 Q. Did you do study on the effect of nicotine on  
28 biological systems when you were at University of  
29 Florida getting your Ph.D.?  
30 A. Yes, I did.  
31 Q. What was the reason for your studying  
32 nicotine at the University of Florida when you were

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19198

1 getting your education there?  
2 A. Nicotine is a drug that's been used for  
3 really over 100 years, to study that acetylcholine  
4 system. It was a fundamental compound for  
5 developing the concept of what we call receptors,  
6 which is what drugs and even our own indigenous body  
7 chemicals fit into. Nicotine works on these  
8 particular receptors, which actually have now been  
9 called nicotinic receptors, because that's where

10 they were studied. All our research uses nicotine  
11 to study the nervous system.  
12 Q. We will go over each of those terms you used,  
13 receptors, acetylcholine, nicotine, perhaps in more  
14 depth, but we will go through your background a  
15 little bit.  
16 A. Okay.  
17 Q. Have you ever been an employee of a tobacco  
18 company?  
19 A. No.  
20 Q. Yet, nonetheless, you have researched  
21 nicotine when you were with the college?  
22 A. Right.  
23 Q. And then when you were in graduate school.  
24 Have you done research on nicotine since 1971  
25 forward?  
26 A. Yes. That's been the focus of my research  
27 throughout my career.  
28 Q. All right. After you got your Ph.D., what  
29 year was that, 1975?  
30 A. 1975, correct.  
31 Q. What did you do when you got that Ph.D.?  
32 A. Then, I pursued further graduate --

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19199

1 postgraduate work at Vanderbilt University medical  
2 school, in Nashville, from 1975 to 1977, as a  
3 research associate or a postdoctoral position.  
4 Q. Vanderbilt is in Nashville. What kind of  
5 work did you do there? What kind of research?  
6 A. Again, it was a continuation of my nicotine  
7 research work, and we were investigating nicotine as  
8 it applied to maternal cigarette smoking and birth  
9 weight of babies.  
10 Q. You were actually doing studies to see  
11 whether nicotine affected pregnancy and the birth  
12 weight of children born of smoking mothers?  
13 A. Right. We were investigating whether  
14 nicotine affected the transport of nutrients across  
15 the placenta of smoking mothers.  
16 Q. How long did you remain at Vanderbilt?  
17 A. Two years.  
18 Q. Then, what happened to you?  
19 A. Then, I was offered a position at Louisville,  
20 at the University of Louisville, School of Medicine,  
21 and went up there 1977.  
22 Q. How did you -- I know it's not that far from  
23 Nashville to Louisville, but how did you manage to  
24 get there? How were they attracted to you?  
25 A. There was a new professor chairman of the  
26 Pharmacology Department who had just come on board  
27 the year before and he was given several faculty  
28 positions, and he actually talked to me at a Chicago  
29 meeting and was interested in my work with nicotine  
30 because the State of Kentucky had begun a University  
31 of Kentucky Tobacco and Health Research Institute,  
32 which taxes the cigarettes and applies that tax to  
HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19200

1 research involving nicotine and other aspects of  
2 smoking, and Dr. Waddell was the new chairman's



3 name, thought that I would be a good fit for being  
4 able to obtain research funding to continue my work  
5 with nicotine at Louisville.

6 Q. And you've been there 27 years?

7 A. Right.

8 Q. During those 27 years that you were there,  
9 did you receive funding from the organization that  
10 you mentioned, the Kentucky Tobacco and Health  
11 Research Institute?

12 A. Yes, I did.

13 Q. Now, is that institute a state agency of the  
14 government of Kentucky?

15 A. Yes. That's set up by the state legislature  
16 of the state.

17 Q. You said that in Kentucky they tax cigarettes  
18 and provide funding through that agency?

19 A. Correct.

20 Q. And you received grants from that  
21 organization for how many years?

22 A. Off and on, for, I don't know, ten or 12  
23 years, probably.

24 Q. Did there ever come a time when you applied  
25 for grant funding to the federal government?

26 A. Yes.

27 Q. And when did you begin receiving or have you  
28 ever begun receiving federal grant money?

29 A. Yes, I have.

30 Q. Is it correct, Dr. Rowell, that professors at  
31 universities, to do their research, they typically  
32 need funding from either a private source or a state  
HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753  
19201

1 agency or a federal agency? That's just the way the  
2 system works, right?

3 A. That's correct.

4 Q. So, professors like you compete for grant  
5 money to fund the research that you want to do?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. So, for some period of time, the federal  
8 government has given you grant money to do research  
9 on things dealing with pharmacology?

10 A. That's correct.

11 Q. Now, have those grant monies come from the  
12 National Institute of Health, NIH?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. What is the National Institute of Health?

15 A. That's an institute that really provides  
16 funding through a number of subagencies for heart  
17 research and cancer research and drug research of  
18 all kinds. There are several agencies under that,  
19 or institutes under that.

20 Q. For example, is the National Cancer Institute  
21 part of the National Institute of Health?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. Is the National Institute on Drug Addiction  
24 also a -- one of those agencies under the umbrella  
25 of the National Institute of Health?

26 A. Yes. The National Institutes of Drug Abuse,  
27 right.

28 Q. Drug abuse. I'm sorry. Has that institute  
29 funded your research?

30 A. Yes.

31 Q. Now, in order to get funded by the federal  
32 government, do they have to recognize you as a  
HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19202

1 respected scientist in the field that you're seeking  
2 to research?

3 A. Yes. Those are very critically evaluated  
4 grant applications.

5 Q. And for your career for 30 years, you have  
6 been focusing on research on nicotine pharmacology;  
7 is that correct?

8 A. Right.

9 Q. Have you worked on chemicals other than  
10 nicotine?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. Like what? Give us some examples.

13 A. Well, I've worked on a lot of nicotine  
14 analogs or agents that are kind of like nicotine and  
15 work in little bit different ways, epibatidine,  
16 anabasine. I've worked on cocaine, amphetamines.  
17 They're psychostimulant drugs. Then, I've worked on  
18 other drugs, glutamate and GABA and some other  
19 compounds.

20 Q. All right. Did there come a time when you  
21 were contacted by counsel for tobacco companies who  
22 asked you to serve as an expert consultant or  
23 consider serving as an expert consultant on the  
24 issue of nicotine pharmacology?

25 A. Yes.

26 Q. When did that happen?

27 A. 1995.

28 Q. 1995. So, from 1971, when you first started  
29 down in Florida studying nicotine pharmacology, all  
30 the way to 1995, had any of your research on  
31 anything you had ever been -- done been funded by a  
32 tobacco company?

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19203

1 A. No.

2 Q. I understand, Doctor, today you're being paid  
3 for your time to come down here and your expenses to  
4 come down and give testimony, right?

5 A. That's right.

6 Q. When you were contacted in 1995, what is it  
7 that you were asked to do or to consider doing?

8 A. I was asked to do a review of the published  
9 literature that was available to all scientists,  
10 peer-reviewed published literature that was out in  
11 the open on the important significant advances that  
12 had happened in nicotine pharmacology. I, of  
13 course, was familiar with a lot of that, being in  
14 the field, but we were asked to put together a  
15 report on the important significant scientific  
16 advances that had to do with nicotine and how  
17 nicotine worked.

18 Q. For doing that work, you were going to be  
19 paid for your time doing that work, your report?

20 A. We put that in as a contract. I did that  
21 with a colleague. I didn't profit personally from  
22 that.

23 Q. Who was your colleague that worked with you

24 on this report?  
25 A. Dr. Laurence Carr.  
26 Q. Now, Dr. Rowell, while you yourself did not  
27 receive funding from a tobacco company, did you ever  
28 work with any scientist that had received funding  
29 from a tobacco company to do research?  
30 A. Yes.  
31 Q. For example?  
32 A. The Council for Tobacco Research has funded a  
HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19204

1 lot of scientists over the years, and my  
2 postdoctoral, Dr. Rama Sastry, part of his research  
3 was funded by CCR money, not directly from tobacco  
4 companies.  
5 Q. Were you aware of that at the time, back at  
6 Vanderbilt, were you aware that Dr. Sastry's work  
7 was being funded by Council for Tobacco Research?  
8 A. No, because I wasn't involved in grant  
9 applications or the distribution of the funds.  
10 Q. Have you worked with other scientists over  
11 the course of your career that have had research  
12 funded by tobacco industry?  
13 A. Well, I mean, I collaborate with individuals  
14 who have done that, but probably not worked  
15 directly. When I was on a sabbatical in 1989, Dr.  
16 Susan Wonnacott had some funding from British  
17 American Tobacco, I believe.  
18 Q. All right. Let's go back to the assignment  
19 that you were asked to undertake. I think you said  
20 that you were asked to review the scientific  
21 literature that had been published that related to  
22 nicotine and its effect on the body?  
23 A. Right.  
24 Q. Is that correct?  
25 A. Yes.  
26 Q. Were you asked to go back in time and do that  
27 sort of as a historical review?  
28 A. Well, basically, we were just given that kind  
29 of overview, but we did, in fact, go back in time to  
30 the beginning of when nicotine was first isolated  
31 and discovered.  
32 Q. And when was that?  
HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19205

1 A. That was in the 1840s, 150-something years  
2 ago.  
3 Q. Have there been articles published in the  
4 scientific literature concerning nicotine and its  
5 affect on the body since the -- since 1850s forward?  
6 A. Yes, thousands.  
7 Q. Thousands of articles. And did you and Dr.  
8 Carr actually review these thousands of articles?  
9 A. We probably reviewed about 1,000 or so  
10 articles, yes.  
11 Q. You're not going to tell us about all  
12 thousand here today, are you?  
13 A. I hope not.  
14 Q. I do, too. But you did prepare a paper, a  
15 summary of what you found in the literature?  
16 A. Yes.

17 Q. In terms of reviewing the literature, what  
18 sources did you look to to find articles and studies  
19 about nicotine?  
20 A. Well, we used a number of different sources.  
21 We used a number of books that were in the 1960s and  
22 early on, the Larson, Haag and Silvette, which is  
23 kind of an encyclopedia of the work in nicotine up  
24 to about the early 1960s.  
25 Q. Can I stop you there a moment?  
26 A. Sure.  
27 Q. When you say Larson, Silvette, are you  
28 referring to this book that I have in my hand  
29 entitled Tobacco, Experimental and Clinical Studies  
30 by Professors Larson, Haag and Silvette?  
31 A. Yes.  
32 Q. For the record, this book has been admitted  
HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19206

1 into evidence as AN-0000776, but, Doctor, you said  
2 you looked in this book for articles on nicotine,  
3 correct?  
4 A. That's right.  
5 Q. Prior to getting your assignment or being  
6 retained as an expert consultant in 1995, had you  
7 ever seen this book prior to that time?  
8 A. Yes.  
9 Q. Where had you seen it?  
10 A. I have a copy of that book. It's my own copy  
11 in my office. So, I refer to it, have always  
12 referred to it.  
13 Q. Have you had it -- for how many years have  
14 you had a copy of this in your office?  
15 A. Oh, gosh, probably since the early 1980s,  
16 probably.  
17 Q. All right. And you -- you read it and  
18 reviewed it prior to being contacted by any tobacco  
19 company?  
20 A. Yes.  
21 Q. Was it considered by you a basic source of  
22 pharmacology with respect to the substance of  
23 nicotine?  
24 A. Yes. It's kind of a review of the literature  
25 that's been published from the very early days right  
26 up until when that was published in 1962.  
27 Q. All right. Now, was this the only source  
28 that you looked at to find articles about nicotine?  
29 A. No.  
30 Q. Where else did you look?  
31 A. There are other books or reviews. For  
32 example, there's a book called Tobacco Alkaloids in  
HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19207

1 1965. The National Library of Medicine puts out a  
2 whole series of annual research called the Index  
3 Medicus. We looked at those. Since 1966, that has  
4 been computerized and you can actually go in and do  
5 a computer search for keywords, like nicotine and  
6 things like that. We use the computer database  
7 quite a bit since that started in 1966.  
8 Q. When you would use the computer base, would  
9 you find actual hard copies of articles and print

10       them out or get them from libraries and read them?  
11       A.       Well, we would find the citation to the  
12       article and then we would request it from the  
13       library or get it also electronically. We can get  
14       the hard-copy article. So, we did, in fact, read  
15       the articles, yes.  
16       Q.       Now, at the end of the process -- how long  
17       did the process take you?  
18       A.       Took about a year and a half.  
19       Q.       And this was working both with you and Dr.  
20       Carr?  
21       A.       Right, and that's, of course, off and on. We  
22       didn't do that -- because we still had a full-time  
23       job.  
24       Q.       Was Dr. Carr also on the faculty at  
25       University of Louisville?  
26       A.       Yes.  
27       Q.       What was his area of expertise?  
28       A.       He was also involved with nicotine research  
29       more as it applied to neuroendocrine effects, or  
30       hormone effects, but he was the other  
31       neuropharmacology colleague.  
32       Q.       All right. Did you ultimately complete a  
          HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
          New Orleans, Louisiana           (504) 525-1753  
  19208

1       paper that summarized your historical review of  
2       nicotine's actions as demonstrated in the published  
3       literature?  
4       A.       Yes.  
5               MR. SCHNEIDER:  
6               I would like to call for Exhibit  
7               GK-000350 to be placed on the screen for the  
8               witness, Counsel and the Court.  
9       EXAMINATION BY MR. SCHNEIDER:  
10       Q.       Do you see that document before you, Dr.  
11       Rowell?  
12       A.       Yes.  
13       Q.       Do you recognize that to be the first page of  
14       your historical review of nicotine's actions?  
15       A.       Right. That's the cover to the review.  
16               MR. SCHNEIDER:  
17               Your Honor, I would request permission  
18               to publish this document and admit it into  
19               evidence.  
20               MR. BRUNO:  
21               We have no objection, Your Honor.  
22               THE COURT:  
23               You may publish, and it will be  
24               received.  
25       EXAMINATION BY MR. SCHNEIDER:  
26       Q.       I have up on the screen for the jury this  
27       document. Is that the cover page of your report  
28       that you prepared over a year and a half of study on  
29       the review of nicotine's actions?  
30       A.       Yes, it is.  
31       Q.       All right. Approximately how long is that  
32       paper?  
          HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
          New Orleans, Louisiana           (504) 525-1753  
  19209

1       A.       That paper's about 60-something pages long,  
2       not including about that many pages of citations.

3 So, it's over 100 pages, I guess.  
4 Q. Does that --  
5 MR. SCHNEIDER:  
6 Bert, are you able to go to the Table of  
7 Contents, which is the next page?  
8 THE COURT:  
9 You may publish it.  
10 MR. SCHNEIDER:  
11 If we may have permission to publish?  
12 Are you able to blow that up at all,  
13 Bert, just the whole page, if you could?  
14 EXAMINATION BY MR. SCHNEIDER:  
15 Q. Doctor, does this Table of Contents  
16 illustrate some of the topics you studied in your  
17 historical review?  
18 A. Yes. That's the first page. It continues  
19 on, but that's the first part of the review.  
20 Q. You studied the chemistry and pharmacokinetics  
21 of nicotine?  
22 A. Right.  
23 Q. And nicotinic receptors?  
24 A. Correct.  
25 Q. And the effect of nicotine in the peripheral  
26 nervous system?  
27 A. Right.  
28 Q. And the central neurochemical effects of  
29 nicotine?  
30 A. Yes.  
31 MR. SCHNEIDER:  
32 May we have permission to publish the  
HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753  
19210  
1 next page of the Table of Contents, Your  
2 Honor?  
3 THE COURT:  
4 You may publish it.  
5 MR. SCHNEIDER:  
6 Go ahead and blow that whole page up so  
7 we can all see it on this side of the  
8 courtroom.  
9 EXAMINATION BY MR. SCHNEIDER:  
10 Q. And other areas, including nicotine as a  
11 determinate of smoking behavior, correct?  
12 A. Yes.  
13 Q. And these articles and literature that you  
14 cited in this paper, had you reviewed them in the  
15 course of your career in pharmacology before being  
16 retained by the tobacco company?  
17 A. Most of them, yes.  
18 Q. All right. Now, this report, this is a  
19 report summarizing your research into the  
20 literature. Is this a peer-reviewed journal  
21 article?  
22 A. No.  
23 Q. Has this report been published in any way?  
24 A. Yes.  
25 Q. In what form?  
26 A. This was put together as a -- just a book  
27 about a year and a half ago, but it was not  
28 peer-reviewed. We just submitted it for  
29 publication, it was published and it's now a book.  
30 Q. Was it published in its entirety or just

31 various sections from it?  
32 A. It's published up to Chapter 7, right here.  
HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753  
19211

1 Q. Dr. Rowell, you were originally retained to  
2 be an expert consultant to do this work. Did there  
3 ever come a time when you were retained to possibly  
4 serve as an expert witness?  
5 A. Yes.  
6 Q. To come to court and testify about your work  
7 and research?  
8 A. Yes.  
9 Q. Have you, in fact, testified in tobacco cases  
10 involving these defendants as an expert in the field  
11 of nicotine pharmacology?  
12 A. Yes, I have.  
13 Q. How many times have you testified before a  
14 jury on that issue?  
15 A. Two other times. Two times before this.  
16 Q. And was that in Minnesota and Ohio?  
17 A. That's correct.  
18 Q. Okay. Now, was the only task that you were  
19 ever hired to do was to do this historical  
20 literature review and perhaps serve as an expert  
21 witness, or were there any other assignments you  
22 were asked to consider undertaking?  
23 A. Yes. There was a continuation of this  
24 process.  
25 Q. What else -- what other tasks were you asked  
26 to explore?  
27 A. Well, after we had finished writing this  
28 review of the published literature, we were asked if  
29 we would then review internal company documents from  
30 the tobacco -- from various tobacco companies, and  
31 read those documents and make a determination of  
32 whether there was information in those internal  
HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753  
19212

1 documents which had it been published would have  
2 made a significant advancement or what was already  
3 known in the published literature.  
4 Q. Let me see if I understand this. You were  
5 asked to review certain tobacco company documents  
6 and to compare what was in them and to see if there  
7 was anything new or a break through and compared to  
8 what was already published in the literature?  
9 A. Right.  
10 Q. How many such documents did you review?  
11 A. Several thousand documents over these period  
12 of years.  
13 Q. How were these documents selected? Or what  
14 were you told about their selection?  
15 A. My understanding is that those documents had  
16 been identified by the plaintiffs in cases, certain  
17 cases, as being documents that did, in fact, contain  
18 some new or important information about nicotine.  
19 Q. So, in other words, you were asked to review  
20 documents that plaintiffs were selecting from the  
21 files of companies in litigation to see if you  
22 thought they demonstrated anything new compared to  
23 what you saw in the published literature?

24 A. That's correct.  
25 Q. All right. And, Doctor, did you undertake  
26 that review by yourself?  
27 A. No, I did that, again, with Dr. Carr, because  
28 he had also written this with me.  
29 Q. Did you, in fact, complete that review?  
30 A. Well, that review is kind of ongoing, but we  
31 complete it -- as we receive documents, we review  
32 them.

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19213

1 Q. Is it your understanding, Doctor, that some  
2 of the documents you reviewed have been introduced  
3 as exhibits -- as evidence in this case?  
4 A. Yes, that's my understanding.  
5 Q. All right. Now, I want to talk a little bit  
6 about other things, other articles that you have  
7 published. I know you've worked in the field of  
8 nicotine pharmacology for 30 years. So, I assume  
9 you've published an article or two, correct?  
10 A. Yes. Right.  
11 Q. How many peer-reviewed articles have you  
12 published in the field of nicotine pharmacology?  
13 A. Around 40, I guess --  
14 Q. All right.  
15 A. -- peer-reviewed articles.  
16 Q. Have those articles dealt with the effects of  
17 nicotine on the brain, on the nervous system?  
18 A. Yes. Most of them.  
19 Q. Do they typically involve animal subjects or  
20 human subjects?  
21 A. These were almost all animal subjects.  
22 Q. All right. And in terms of your work in the  
23 field and publishing research, have you also  
24 reviewed studies of others, other scientists?  
25 A. Sure.  
26 Q. Have you relied on the work of other  
27 scientists in reaching conclusions that you make in  
28 your articles?  
29 A. Yes, I have.  
30 Q. And will you also rely on the research that's  
31 been done in the field of nicotine pharmacology in  
32 giving your opinions here today?

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19214

1 A. Yes.  
2 Q. Now, you have told us that your work has  
3 focused on the effect of nicotine on the nervous  
4 system. What is the nervous system?  
5 A. The nervous system is one of the several  
6 systems of the body. We have the cardiovascular  
7 system, which is our heart and blood vessels, and  
8 the endocrine system, which is our hormones, and the  
9 immune system and such. The nervous system is the  
10 system that uses nerve cells to convey information  
11 really between nerves and sometimes out to the  
12 organs of the body, to speed up the heart or to  
13 cause you to sweat or dilate your pupils. These are  
14 all caused by nerve cells conducting information  
15 down to either systems or other nerves.  
16 Q. Does the nervous system also include the



17 brain?  
18 A. Yes.  
19 Q. Has your work included the study of the  
20 brain?  
21 A. Right. That's a major part of the nervous  
22 system called the central nervous system.  
23 Q. And you studied the anatomy of the brain?  
24 A. Yes.  
25 Q. And you have studied how the brain functions?  
26 A. Yes.  
27 Q. And you've studied how nicotine works in the  
28 brain?  
29 A. Right. That's been the focus of my studies.  
30 Q. All right. Have you done any work at all  
31 that has involved the study of human subjects at  
32 all?

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19215

1 A. A few studies, very few.  
2 Q. But have you reviewed the literature that's  
3 been published where other scientists have studied  
4 using human subjects?  
5 A. Right. We do a lot of that, but in the  
6 laboratory, it's mainly animals, and we do a lot of  
7 studies on the literature for human subjects.  
8 Q. I think you told us your work has been peer-  
9 reviewed and published. Have any of your research  
10 findings been the first finding of its kind?  
11 A. Yes.  
12 Q. Can you give us an example of such a first  
13 finding?  
14 A. Well, in 1983, we published a study showing  
15 that there were excitatory nicotinic receptors in  
16 the brain which stimulated the release of  
17 acetylcholine, a neurotransmitter I talked about  
18 earlier. That was the first time it was shown that  
19 there were excitatory receptors on these.  
20 Q. Doctor, I want to see if I have in mind the  
21 article that you're referring to. Is that an  
22 article that you wrote in 1984 entitled "Nicogenic  
23 Stimulation of 3H Acetylcholine Release From Mouse  
24 Cerebral Cortical Synaptosomes"?

MR. SCHNEIDER:

26 Let me ask you to put up on the screen  
27 before the witness GK-00554 for His Honor and  
28 opposing counsel.

EXAMINATION BY MR. SCHNEIDER:

30 Q. Doctor, do you recognize that document before  
31 you?  
32 A. Yes.

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19216

1 MR. SCHNEIDER:

2 Can you go to the second page of that  
3 for the Court and for Counsel and for the  
4 witness.

EXAMINATION BY MR. SCHNEIDER:

6 Q. Doctor, if you could take a look at that  
7 second page?  
8 A. Yes, I see it.  
9 Q. Is that an article entitled "Nicogenic

10 Stimulation of 3H Acetylcholine Release From Mouse  
11 Cerebral Cortical Synaptosomes"?  
12 A. You were great up until the last word.  
13 Q. How do you pronounce that word?  
14 A. Synaptosomes, named after synapses.  
15 MR. SCHNEIDER:  
16 Your Honor, I would request permission  
17 to publish and admit it into evidence.  
18 MR. BRUNO:  
19 There's no objection.  
20 THE COURT:  
21 You may publish and it is received.  
22 MR. SCHNEIDER:  
23 Could you highlight that title? I've  
24 murdered it.  
25 EXAMINATION BY MR. SCHNEIDER:  
26 Q. Is that the title of your article?  
27 A. Yes.  
28 Q. Are you going to explain some of this today  
29 in terms that even I can understand, I hope?  
30 A. I will attempt to do that.  
31 Q. Has your research been cited by the U.S.  
32 Surgeon General?  
HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753  
19217  
1 A. Yes.  
2 MR. SCHNEIDER:  
3 Let me ask, if you could, to pull up  
4 Exhibit PX-904. Plaintiff's Exhibit 904,  
5 previously admitted into evidence for the  
6 Court, the witness and opposing counsel.  
7 EXAMINATION BY MR. SCHNEIDER:  
8 Q. Dr. Rowell, do you see before you the Surgeon  
9 General report of 1988?  
10 A. Well, I see the -- a page, introductory page  
11 for it, yes.  
12 MR. SCHNEIDER:  
13 Your Honor, we would request permission  
14 to publish Page 81 of this Exhibit PX-904  
15 that's already been admitted into evidence.  
16 THE COURT:  
17 No objection, I presume?  
18 MR. BRUNO:  
19 No, Judge.  
20 MR. SCHNEIDER:  
21 Can you put up for the jury and the  
22 witness Page 81 of the 1988 Surgeon General  
23 report.  
24 EXAMINATION BY MR. SCHNEIDER:  
25 Q. First of all, Doctor, this is Page 81 of the  
26 1988 Surgeon General report?  
27 A. That's right.  
28 Q. And the 1988 Surgeon General report, was that  
29 Surgeon General report in which the Surgeon General  
30 found nicotine -- cigarette smoking to be addictive,  
31 correct?  
32 A. That's what the report was called, right.  
HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753  
19218  
1 Q. All right. On Page 81 of this report --  
2 MR. SCHNEIDER:

3 Can you highlight the important part  
4 there, Bert, where there's a citation to some  
5 research articles?  
6 EXAMINATION BY MR. SCHNEIDER:  
7 Q. Is there a citation there in the 1988 Surgeon  
8 General work to your work in the field of nicotine  
9 pharmacology?  
10 A. Right.  
11 Q. Now, Doctor, do you continue to do research  
12 on the impact of nicotine on the brain even today?  
13 A. Yes.  
14 Q. Are you a member of any scientific research  
15 organizations?  
16 A. Yes, I am.  
17 Q. Can you give us some examples of those?  
18 A. I'm a member of the American Society for  
19 Neurochemistry, the International Society for  
20 Neurochemistry, the International Brain Research  
21 Organization, Society for Research on Nicotine and  
22 Tobacco, American Society for Pharmacology and  
23 Experimental Therapeutics. I mean, others.  
24 Q. The list goes on. Are there special  
25 requirements to be admitted into those societies?  
26 A. Yes.  
27 Q. During your career as a pharmacologist, have  
28 you been trained on the effects, the withdrawal  
29 effects, of various drugs?  
30 A. Yes.  
31 Q. Do you keep up with the scientific literature  
32 with respect to the withdrawal effects to be  
HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753  
19219  
1 recorded to be associated with various drugs related  
2 to caffeine, to cocaine, nicotine and other drugs?  
3 A. Yes.  
4 Q. With respect to smoking behavior, Doctor,  
5 when I use that term and you use that term in your  
6 article, what do you mean by that? What is smoking  
7 behavior?  
8 A. Smoking behavior encompasses a whole range of  
9 behavioral activities that are associated with  
10 smoking, from the manipulation of the cigarette to  
11 the repetitive nature of it, the ritualistic nature  
12 of it as it is associated with different activities,  
13 like drinking coffee or watching television or  
14 different things. So, it's a complex behavioral  
15 activity.  
16 Q. All right. Have you studied the literature,  
17 the scientific literature, that relates to smoking  
18 behavior and its relationship to nicotine?  
19 A. Yes.  
20 Q. Have you measured the levels of nicotine in  
21 the bloodstream of smokers?  
22 A. Yes.  
23 Q. All right. And have you done comparisons or  
24 reviewed literature comparing the effect of nicotine  
25 being delivered to a smoker intravenously versus  
26 through smoking?  
27 A. Yes.  
28 Q. And have you actually observed smoking  
29 behavior, smokers smoking and engaging in what's  
30 classical smoking behavior?

31 A. Sure. We've all seen that.  
32 Q. And you've done that over your 30-plus  
HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753  
19220

1 career?

2 A. Sure.

3 MR. SCHNEIDER:

4 Your Honor, at this time, the defendants  
5 would like to tender Dr. Peter Rowell as an  
6 expert in the field of nicotine pharmacology,  
7 the effect of nicotine on the body, its  
8 relation to smoking behavior and addiction or  
9 dependence and the historical knowledge of  
10 nicotine and its actions.

11 Take that screen down.

12 And we make Dr. Rowell available for  
13 examination.

14 MR. BRUNO:

15 Thank you very much.

16 Good afternoon, everybody, Your Honor.

17 THE COURT:

18 Cross on qualifications, Mr. Bruno?

19 MR. BRUNO:

20 If I may, Judge.

21 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. BRUNO:

22 Q. All right. Doctor, we just met this  
23 afternoon, did we not?

24 A. Yes, a few minutes ago.

25 Q. All right. And you have given about 12  
26 different depositions in tobacco cases over the --  
27 these many years, have you not?

28 A. That's right.

29 Q. All right. And I think that you told this  
30 jury that the first work that you did for the  
31 cigarette companies was the preparation of this  
32 history; is that correct?

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753  
19221

1 A. That's correct.

2 Q. But you didn't tell the jury that when you  
3 were contacted to do this work, that the folks who  
4 contacted you didn't tell you that they were working  
5 for tobacco, did they?

6 A. I don't remember whether they did or not.  
7 The first contact was a phone call that came from an  
8 environmental place, and I don't remember. It was  
9 just the initial phone call.

10 Q. Right. It was a -- you gave the depositions,  
11 all 12 of them, which I read, and you said in your  
12 deposition that they represented to you that there  
13 was some environmental health outfit, and you did  
14 not know that they were associated with tobacco when  
15 you got the phone call; isn't that true?

16 A. I don't recall knowing that. That's correct.

17 Q. Okay. And when you agreed to do the work,  
18 you had some reticence about them even giving you a  
19 check; isn't that true?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. And would you tell the jury why it is that  
22 you had some concern about receiving a check from  
23 these cigarette companies?

24 A. Because I had not seen any internal tobacco  
25 documents. So, I didn't know whether the internal  
26 tobacco documents or the work was, in fact, hidden  
27 research that nobody knew about, that there was some  
28 detrimental information in there. So, I, like  
29 everybody else, would have been concerned about  
30 something I didn't know and to want to work on  
31 something and taking money personally for working  
32 for a tobacco company when I didn't know what was in

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19222

1 the documents.  
2 Q. Right. So, what you decided to do was have  
3 the cigarette company lawyers pay somebody else and  
4 then you, of course, were paid for your time, right?  
5 A. No.  
6 Q. You did it for free?  
7 A. No, but the money didn't come to me  
8 personally. So, I wasn't paid for my time.  
9 Q. Well, did you or did you not get compensated  
10 for the time that you spent in doing this work?  
11 A. No.  
12 Q. Did it for free?  
13 A. No. That money --  
14 Q. I'm confused.  
15 A. Okay.  
16 Q. You spent an hour, let's say, you got on the  
17 computer and you looked for some stuff, right?  
18 A. Right.  
19 Q. An hour of your time was expended, right?  
20 A. Right.  
21 Q. And you got a paycheck while you were doing  
22 that work, right?  
23 A. No.  
24 Q. You didn't get a paycheck?  
25 A. No.  
26 Q. So, it was for free?  
27 A. No. I didn't get a paycheck. I'd like to  
28 explain, if I could.  
29 Q. You can explain all you want. That's my  
30 rule. That's Bruno's rule. But you got to say  
31 "Yes" or "No" first.  
32 A. No, I did not get a paycheck.

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19223

1 Q. Okay.  
2 A. We agreed at the beginning that not knowing  
3 what was going to happen with our review, that the  
4 money would be paid to the University of Louisville.  
5 So, it was not done for free. The law firms paid  
6 for the work, but I did not receive a check. That  
7 money went to and was written to the University of  
8 Louisville and remains today in a research  
9 foundation of the University of Louisville. I did  
10 not receive money. I mean, I can't buy groceries or  
11 anything with that money.  
12 Q. Well, you got a paycheck --  
13 A. No.  
14 Q. -- from the university?  
15 A. No. Well, I got the same paycheck I've been  
16 getting, which didn't go up any when I did the work.

17 Q. That's fine. Let's be honest and  
18 straightforward with the jury.  
19 MR. WITTMANN:  
20 Objection, Your Honor.  
21 EXAMINATION BY MR. BRUNO:  
22 Q. You received a check from the university --  
23 THE COURT:  
24 Wait a minute, Mr. Wittmann. Are you  
25 objecting to the last question or this one?  
26 MR. WITTMANN:  
27 His preface, Your Honor, to this  
28 question.  
29 THE COURT:  
30 That's overruled.  
31 Ask your question, Mr. Bruno.  
32 EXAMINATION BY MR. BRUNO:

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19224

1 Q. I know you're not trying to mislead the jury.  
2 The fact of the matter is that your employer was the  
3 university?  
4 A. Right.  
5 Q. Your employer allowed you to do this work on,  
6 shall we say, company time, right?  
7 A. No.  
8 Q. So, you did it outside of company time?  
9 A. Yes.  
10 Q. Okay. So, it wasn't reimbursed?  
11 A. It wasn't reimbursed to me.  
12 Q. To you.  
13 A. Right.  
14 Q. Okay. That's fine. Finally got that cleared  
15 up.  
16 Now, you told this jury that this was  
17 exceptionally exhaustive work, right?  
18 A. Well, I think it was an exhaustive review of  
19 the literature. I don't know whether it was  
20 exhaustive to me.  
21 Q. No. But my point is that you looked  
22 everywhere that you could look for articles on the  
23 subject of nicotine and the action of nicotine,  
24 right?  
25 A. Right, in the published literature, right.  
26 Q. Would you have -- would you have done the  
27 work if these cigarette lawyers had provided you  
28 with the articles to look at?  
29 A. No, because that wasn't what we did.  
30 Q. Right. You wanted to maintain your own  
31 integrity and you wanted to do the search for the  
32 articles your own self, correct?

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19225

1 A. Correct.  
2 Q. So that when you took that witness stand and  
3 you took that oath, you could tell the jury I did an  
4 exhaustive search. This is the result of my one and  
5 a half years of inquiry, right?  
6 A. No. Only because the second part of your  
7 question, when we did the research, I had no idea  
8 that I would ever be called as a witness or have  
9 anything to do with a tobacco case when I did that

10 work. So, I didn't do it so that I could get on a  
11 witness stand and testify to anything.  
12 Q. Okay. Well, the fact of the matter is that  
13 this work has been used for a litigation tool since  
14 it was completed, right?  
15 A. Yes, apparently.  
16 Q. Now, you are really an expert when it comes  
17 right down to it, on the dopamine release in the  
18 brain; isn't that accurate?  
19 A. That's one of the things.  
20 Q. Okay. And you've done no personal research  
21 on this subject of addiction, have you?  
22 A. Well, that -- that is very much tied into  
23 addiction. So, I would say that is the fundamental  
24 biochemical basis which most people ascribe to  
25 addiction. But as far as population studies, I  
26 mean, I'm not a sociologist. So, I haven't done  
27 human research. I'm a basic science laboratory  
28 researcher.  
29 Q. Your research work has really been confined  
30 to animal studies?  
31 A. Right, because that's the only place you can  
32 do that research.

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19226

1 Q. Very much like Dr. Victor DeNoble which, of  
2 course, you know about because you've read the  
3 documents and the jury's heard about Dr. DeNoble,  
4 right?  
5 A. Yes.  
6 Q. Now, you're not a psychiatrist, right?  
7 A. That's correct.  
8 Q. So, you don't diagnose addiction in humans,  
9 right?  
10 A. No, I don't do that personally, right.  
11 Q. And you don't diagnose dependency in humans  
12 either?  
13 A. That's correct.  
14 Q. And I think in your many, many depositions,  
15 you told -- the question of you're not an expert in  
16 human behavior, right?  
17 A. I'm not, as I said, a psychiatrist or a  
18 psychologist, although my undergraduate degree is in  
19 psychology. I'm an expert, I guess I would say,  
20 understanding the human behavior and nicotine  
21 connection, not in human behavior in general.  
22 Q. To the extent that there's not a drug basis  
23 for behavior, are you an expert or are you not?  
24 A. I would say not an expert on just behaviors  
25 in general.  
26 Q. Okay. All right. You talked -- just a  
27 moment ago, you talked about the measuring of  
28 nicotine -- did you measure the nicotine in the  
29 blood of the rats or humans, whatever you were --  
30 A. Both.  
31 Q. You measured -- did you measure the nicotine  
32 in the brain?

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19227

1 A. Yes, I have.  
2 Q. Okay.

3 A. Not from humans.  
4 Q. Not from humans. Okay. Now, do you  
5 appreciate, Doctor, that the purpose of expert  
6 testimony is to assist these ladies and gentlemen of  
7 the jury in resolving questions of fact?  
8 A. Yes.  
9 Q. Okay.  
10 MR. BRUNO:  
11 May we have on the screen PR-02, and the  
12 last page, if you don't mind, Carl.  
13 If Your Honor please, may I publish this  
14 to the jury?  
15 THE COURT:  
16 No objection, I presume?  
17 MR. SCHNEIDER:  
18 No objection, Your Honor.  
19 THE COURT:  
20 You may publish.  
21 EXAMINATION BY MR. BRUNO:  
22 Q. What I'm showing the jury, Doctor, is the  
23 last page of the expert report that you prepared in  
24 this case. You recognize it, don't you?  
25 A. Yes.  
26 Q. Okay. The reason I'm doing this, because I'm  
27 personally confused about the expert opinions that  
28 you have. And whether they're going to help us  
29 resolve some questions in the case.  
30 MR. BRUNO:  
31 Can we highlight the bullet point, Carl,  
32 that starts with the sentence: "Cigarette  
HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753  
19228  
1 smoking is not just a nicotine delivery  
2 device"?  
3 EXAMINATION BY MR. BRUNO:  
4 Q. You see that, Doctor?  
5 A. Yes.  
6 Q. That first sentence, that sounds vaguely  
7 familiar to me. That's something that -- well,  
8 actually, it's not something exactly that a  
9 cigarette company employee said. It's something  
10 like, right?  
11 MR. WITTMANN:  
12 Your Honor, I object. May I approach  
13 the bench?  
14 THE COURT:  
15 You may approach.  
16 (Whereupon, a sidebar conference is held  
17 as follows:)  
18 MR. WITTMANN:  
19 Your Honor, Mr. Bruno continues to make  
20 these long diatribes before asking a  
21 question, and I object to his making those  
22 kinds of statements trying to summarize  
23 testimony in that type of question instead of  
24 just asking a question. It's improper.  
25 MR. SCHNEIDER:  
26 I have a second ground for objection.  
27 MR. BRUNO:  
28 I think it's appropriate to give the  
29 jury a context for the question so they'll  
30 know what in the heck you're about to ask



31                   them. That's all that's intended by that.  
32                   THE COURT:  
HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana                   (504) 525-1753  
19229

1                   Well, you go a little further than that.  
2                   You say, "it sounds familiar," et cetera.  
3                   Let me see what you said was. Something the  
4                   cigarette companies said before. Don't do  
5                   that anymore.  
6                   MR. BRUNO:  
7                   All right.  
8                   MR. SCHNEIDER:  
9                   My second round of objection, Your  
10                  Honor, is this is supposed to be cross on  
11                  qualifications. He's asking opinions. I  
12                  haven't even elicited opinions yet. I don't  
13                  think it's appropriate to go into opinions.  
14                  MR. BRUNO:  
15                  That's a good point. It's unusual that  
16                  I'm doing this. If you look up there, you  
17                  will see that these are opinions that are not  
18                  in controversy in this case at all. If you  
19                  look at the next line, he says cigarette  
20                  smoking is not addictive. In this case, in  
21                  opening statement, they admitted it is  
22                  addictive and their responses to the requests  
23                  for admissions, they say it is addictive. In  
24                  their websites, they say it is addictive.  
25                  I'm trying to figure out what in the heck --  
26                  because if he's offering opinions on things  
27                  that are not at issue in the case, he ought  
28                  not be qualified at the outset, not at the  
29                  end. He can't be tendered as an expert if  
30                  what he has to say doesn't help the finders  
31                  of fact make determinations of fact in this  
32                  case. That's why I want to make that

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana                   (504) 525-1753  
19230

1                  inquiry.  
2                  MR. SCHNEIDER:  
3                  We're back on the word addiction.  
4                  MR. BRUNO:  
5                  That's why I put it up there.  
6                  THE COURT:  
7                  Mr. Schneider?  
8                  MR. SCHNEIDER:  
9                  I qualified him as an expert in the  
10                 field of nicotine pharmacology. I have not  
11                 asked him his opinions yet because Your Honor  
12                 has not accepted him yet. I will ask him --  
13                 Mr. Bruno's questions can wait for  
14                 cross-examination. Qualify him first and  
15                 then he gives his opinion.  
16                 THE COURT:  
17                 I will allow some latitude on cross and  
18                 qualifications. Cross is wide open. I think  
19                 that applies to qualifications as well as  
20                 direct. So, Mr. Wittmann's objection is  
21                 sustained.  
22                 Change your form of questioning.  
23                 The other objection is overruled.

24 MR. BRUNO:  
25 Thank you, Judge.  
26 (End of sidebar.)  
27 EXAMINATION BY MR. BRUNO:  
28 Q. Dr. Rowell, the first sentence: "Cigarette  
29 smoking is not just a nicotine delivery device"?  
30 A. That's my opinion.  
31 Q. I understand that, but do you believe that to  
32 be an issue in the case? In other words, do you  
HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19231

1 believe that the plaintiffs in this case are telling  
2 this jury that a cigarette is just a nicotine  
3 delivery device?  
4 A. I don't know. I haven't been involved in --  
5 I haven't been in the courtroom. I don't know what  
6 the plaintiffs are telling the juries. That's my  
7 opinion, that it is not just a nicotine delivery  
8 device.  
9 Q. I understand that. Even the tobacco company  
10 executive who uttered those words did not put the  
11 word just in his sentence; isn't that true?  
12 A. I don't know what you're talking -- I mean, I  
13 don't --  
14 Q. You don't know. Well, who told you to  
15 comment on that question, then?  
16 A. I wrote that myself from my own opinion. I  
17 didn't get that from anyplace.  
18 Q. You didn't get that from a tobacco company  
19 document where a tobacco company executive utters  
20 words similar to what's on that line?  
21 A. I did not get that from any tobacco company  
22 document or executive. I wrote that myself for my  
23 own opinion.  
24 Q. That's fine.  
25 A. And there may have been tobacco company  
26 documents that said something similar to that.  
27 Q. If I told you that the plaintiffs in this  
28 case do not allege that the cigarette smoking is  
29 just a nicotine delivery device, then you really  
30 can't offer any help to this jury in making that  
31 determination, can you?  
32 A. No.

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19232

1 Q. If it's not an issue?  
2 A. I would agree with you then. You agree with  
3 me.  
4 Q. We agree. It's not just. It does a whole  
5 lot of other stuff, like kill people.  
6 MR. LONG:  
7 Objection, Your Honor.  
8 THE COURT:  
9 Sustained.  
10 The jury will disregard the testimony by  
11 Mr. Bruno.  
12 MR. BRUNO:  
13 Sorry.  
14 EXAMINATION BY MR. BRUNO:  
15 Q. Second sentence there, you say it's not  
16 appropriate to classify individuals who engage in

17 cigarette smoking as "addicts."  
18 A. That's my opinion.  
19 Q. That's fine. Do you believe that the learned  
20 counsel on this side of the room are alleging in  
21 this case that cigarette smokers are addicts?  
22 A. I don't know what the plaintiffs are  
23 alleging.  
24 Q. You don't know. How about this? If I tell  
25 you we're not alleging that they're addicts, you  
26 have nothing to offer to the jury on that point  
27 because it's not an issue, right?  
28 A. I don't know. That has been used by many,  
29 many people, that cigarette smokers are drug  
30 addicts. I don't know whether plaintiffs are  
31 alleging that in this case.  
32 Q. Would you agree with me when the phrase is  
HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19233

1 used in the context of cigarette smoking, it's  
2 mostly in a humorous context?  
3 A. No, I don't think so. I think there are  
4 antitobacco advocates that have used the fact that  
5 cigarettes are a nicotine-delivery device and  
6 really, they're just drug addicts. I've read that  
7 many times.  
8 Q. Finally, you say that cigarette smoking  
9 behavior is not an addiction, right?  
10 A. I think it's inappropriate to classify that  
11 as an addiction.  
12 Q. This is where I'm a little puzzled.  
13 A. Okay.  
14 Q. The opinions that you're offering to this  
15 jury, are they the opinions of the R.J. Reynolds  
16 Tobacco Company?  
17 A. I don't know.  
18 Q. You don't know?  
19 A. No. I'm not a -- you know, I'm not here to  
20 support or advance or be a spokesman for the tobacco  
21 industry, so, I'm here as a independent researcher.  
22 Q. Well, okay.  
23 A. And that's my opinion.  
24 Q. I've got to ask these questions and we'll  
25 figure that out in a minute.  
26 A. Okay.  
27 Q. Brown and Williamson, are your opinions in  
28 this courtroom, are they the opinions of the Brown  
29 and Williamson Tobacco Company?  
30 A. They're my opinions. If the tobacco  
31 companies agree with me, fine. If not, too bad. If  
32 the plaintiffs agree with me, that's great.  
HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19234

1 Q. Well, the -- Philip Morris, are your opinions  
2 the opinions of the Philip Morris company in this  
3 case?  
4 A. Well, I don't know what the opinions of the  
5 Philip Morris company is exactly. So I, if they --  
6 if you have an opinion that they have published and  
7 it agrees with this, then, that's -- wonderful.  
8 Q. Trust me, we're going to get there.  
9 A. Okay.

10 Q. Lorillard. Are your opinions the opinions of  
11 the Lorillard company?  
12 A. I don't know.  
13 Q. You don't know.  
14 A. No.  
15 Q. Do you know what the issues are in this case?  
16 A. My expert opinions are -- I have been asked  
17 to come in and talk about how nicotine works in the  
18 brain and whether there were internal tobacco  
19 documents that would have, had they been published,  
20 advanced the information. That's as a nicotine  
21 researcher, that's the extent of my expertise.  
22 Q. You're not going to tell the jury that  
23 cigarette smoking behavior is not addictive?  
24 A. I'm going to tell them that's a simplistic  
25 and really unhealthful complex to label that as drug  
26 addiction. I will have scientific information to  
27 support the fact that nicotine is not a drug of  
28 tremendous addictive potential.  
29 Q. When you were first hired by the cigarette  
30 companies back in 1997, the cigarette companies were  
31 telling people that they didn't believe that  
32 cigarette smoking was addictive; isn't that true?

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS

New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19235

1 MR. WITTMANN:  
2 Objection. Objection, Your Honor. May  
3 we approach?  
4 THE COURT:  
5 Yes.  
6 (Whereupon, a sidebar conference is held  
7 as follows:)  
8 MR. WITTMANN:  
9 Once again, Your Honor, in the guise of  
10 asking a question, Mr. Bruno is testifying.  
11 I think that's improper examination of the  
12 witness. He can ask a question without these  
13 long lead-ins of what cigarette companies  
14 were saying or not saying at any particular  
15 point in time.  
16 MR. BRUNO:  
17 That was a question. The question was  
18 what --  
19 MR. WITTMANN:  
20 That wasn't the question.  
21 THE COURT:  
22 It was the question.  
23 MR. BRUNO:  
24 That was the question.  
25 MR. WITTMANN:  
26 The other question was --  
27 THE COURT:  
28 The question was: "When you were first  
29 hired by the cigarette companies in 1997, the  
30 cigarette companies were telling people that  
31 they didn't believe tobacco was addictive;  
32 isn't that true?"

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS

New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19236

1 MR. WITTMANN:  
2 He's stating that that's what the

3 cigarette company -- telling people how he  
4 was hired --  
5 THE COURT:  
6 Anything else, Mr. Schneider?  
7 MR. SCHNEIDER:  
8 Yes. I would renew my objection.  
9 You've given Mr. Bruno some latitude. Now  
10 he's asking about what his opinions are,  
11 whether they are going to be his opinions.  
12 Let's let him give the opinions he gives, not  
13 the ones he doesn't give.  
14 THE COURT:  
15 I'll overrule the objections and we will  
16 take our afternoon recess at this point.  
17 (End of sidebar.)  
18 THE COURT:  
19 We will take our afternoon recess at  
20 this point, ladies and gentlemen, until 3:00  
21 p.m. by the wall clock, please.  
22 (Jury excused.)  
23 THE COURT:  
24 Let the record reflect the jury has been  
25 discharged from the courtroom.  
26 Anything for the record by plaintiff  
27 counsel?  
28 MR. BRUNO:  
29 No, Your Honor.  
30 THE COURT:  
31 Defense Counsel?  
32 MR. WITTMANN:

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19237

1 No, Your Honor. We will recess until  
2 3:00 by the wall clock.  
3 (Whereupon, a brief recess is taken.)  
4 THE CLERK:  
5 All rise for the jury, please.  
6 (Jury seated.)  
7 THE LAW CLERK:  
8 All rise. Recess is over. Court will  
9 come to order.  
10 THE COURT:  
11 Please be seated.  
12 One thing on a different subject. I was  
13 given to understand that all the jurors were  
14 in agreement to changing the work schedule so  
15 we would work on May 5th and be off on May  
16 9th. Am I wrong? Did you all agree, or is  
17 there some disagreement?  
18 THE JUROR:  
19 No.  
20 THE COURT:  
21 Everybody agree? Okay. That clears it  
22 up. There was a little confusion in my mind.  
23 I thought you had agreed, but I thought I'd  
24 ask you directly.  
25 THE JUROR:  
26 That's the right date.  
27 THE COURT:  
28 Okay. Thank you.  
29 THE JUROR:  
30 Thank you.

31 THE COURT:  
32 Okay. Thank you.  
HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753  
19238

1 Mr. Bruno.  
2 MR. BRUNO:  
3 Thank you, Judge.  
4 EXAMINATION BY MR. BRUNO:  
5 Q. I'm sorry. Do you prefer to be called Doctor  
6 or Professor?  
7 A. Either one. It doesn't matter. Whatever you  
8 prefer.  
9 Q. All right. Doctor. When you were first  
10 retained by the cigarette companies in 1995, each  
11 and every one of these four cigarette companies  
12 represented by these lawyers in this courtroom took  
13 the public position that cigarette smoking was not  
14 addicting; isn't that true?  
15 A. I don't know.  
16 Q. Well, did they perhaps share with you that in  
17 their opening statement to this jury, they said:  
18 "We agree cigarette smoking can be considered  
19 addictive"?  
20 Did they tell you that?  
21 A. No, they didn't tell me that.  
22 Q. Did -- Brown and Williamson, I guess we'll  
23 start with them because those are the lawyers who  
24 are cross -- I'm sorry -- directing your testimony,  
25 correct?  
26 A. It's a law firm. I don't know who -- I'm not  
27 sure who they represent.  
28 Q. Oh, you don't even know who the lawyers who  
29 met with you represent?  
30 A. I know the law firm, but sometimes I get  
31 mixed up about which law firm is the law firm for  
32 Philip Morris or R.J. Reynolds. I believe it is  
HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753  
19239

1 Brown and Williamson.  
2 Q. Okay. Clearly, whatever it is that you're  
3 doing for one of these companies is exactly the same  
4 for all the other companies, right?  
5 A. I guess so, yes.  
6 Q. I mean, given that, you know, you don't know  
7 which law firm is representing which company,  
8 they're always talking to you about the same thing?  
9 A. Well, it doesn't matter to my opinion at all.  
10 Q. Right. In fact, your opinion has not changed  
11 over these, gosh, five and -- eight years?  
12 A. I haven't reviewed anything or seen any  
13 published science that has made a major change in my  
14 opinion.  
15 Q. Okay.  
16 A. Correct.  
17 Q. All right. But the cigarette companies have  
18 changed their opinion. Did you know that?  
19 A. It's my understanding that their -- some of  
20 their websites, their new websites, agree that  
21 smoking behavior can be classified as an addiction.  
22 Q. All right. Then, you do know that the Brown  
23 and Williamson company says on its website Brown and

24 Williamson believes that smokers should rely on the  
25 advice of appropriate health authorities, such as  
26 the Surgeon General for information on smoking and  
27 health, including the conclusions that smoking  
28 causes disease and is addictive.

29 You know that?

30 A. I read that this morning, yes.

31 Q. Okay. And likewise, the Philip Morris  
32 company, on its website, also says: Cigarette  
HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19240

1 smoking and addiction, we agree with the  
2 overwhelming medical and scientific consensus that  
3 cigarette smoking is addictive. You know that, too,  
4 right?

5 A. I haven't read that, but it doesn't surprise  
6 me.

7 Q. Doesn't surprise you. Okay. And RJR, on  
8 their website, they say many people believe that  
9 smoking is addictive and as that term is commonly  
10 used today, it is -- you knew that, too, right?

11 A. I haven't read that either, but that's --

12 Q. Doesn't surprise you?

13 A. Doesn't surprise me.

14 Q. Finally -- Lorillard doesn't have a website,  
15 but are you familiar with requests for admissions  
16 where a party gets to ask another party do you admit  
17 or deny a fact?

18 A. Actually, I just saw that again this morning.

19 Q. Okay. So, you know that Lorillard, the last  
20 of the four companies in this case, they admit that  
21 smoking can be addictive. They admit that?

22 A. Well, I didn't see that, but, again, that's  
23 not surprising.

24 Q. Okay. So, when the cigarette company lawyers  
25 tell the jury that smoking is addictive and you tell  
26 the jury that smoking is not addictive, who should  
27 they believe?

28 MR. SCHNEIDER:

29 Objection, Your Honor.

30 MR. GAY:

31 Objection.

32 MR. BRUNO:

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19241

1 Withdrawn.

2 A. I had a good answer for that.

3 THE COURT:

4 Withdrawn. I have an objection and I  
5 heard Mr. Bruno say I withdraw. You wish to  
6 approach on your objection, Mr. Schneider?

7 MR. SCHNEIDER:

8 Your Honor, if he withdraws the  
9 question, I guess I can't object.

10 THE COURT:

11 He has withdrawn the question.

12 Next question, please.

13 EXAMINATION BY MR. BRUNO:

14 Q. I'll do a deal. You want to give the answer  
15 anyway?

16 THE COURT:

17 Mr. Bruno, if you have a question, ask  
18 the question.  
19 MR. BRUNO:  
20 All right. Sorry. All right.  
21 MR. BRUNO:  
22 Can we call up PR-02 again? Can we  
23 highlight the first sentence of the next  
24 bullet? Blow it up, please.  
25 EXAMINATION BY MR. BRUNO:  
26 Q. Doctor, this refers to another one of the  
27 opinions that you told the jury a few moments ago on  
28 the tender by your lawyer that you would be offering  
29 in the courtroom, right?  
30 A. Right.  
31 Q. And the first phrase is: There is no  
32 evidence? See that?

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753  
19242

1 A. Yes.  
2 Q. Now, anybody who would listen to that uttered  
3 in this courtroom might believe that you've scoured  
4 the planet and that evidence just doesn't exist,  
5 right?  
6 MR. LONG:  
7 Objection, Your Honor.  
8 MR. WITTMANN:  
9 Objection.  
10 A. No, that's not --  
11 THE COURT:  
12 Just a moment. When you hear the word  
13 objection, don't answer the question until I  
14 rule on the objection and I will instruct you  
15 on whether you should answer or not.  
16 THE WITNESS:  
17 All right.  
18 THE COURT:  
19 You wish to approach on your objection?  
20 MR. LONG:  
21 No. Speculation.  
22 THE COURT:  
23 Overruled. Answer the question if you  
24 can.

25 A. Okay. You said there is no evidence for  
26 words --  
27 EXAMINATION BY MR. BRUNO:  
28 Q. No. No. You said there is no evidence,  
29 right? Let's be clear. You wrote that sentence?  
30 A. I said there's no evidence that studies  
31 conducted by the tobacco industry demonstrated that  
32 nicotine is addicting. I have seen no studies  
HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753  
19243

1 conducted by the tobacco industry that demonstrate  
2 that nicotine is addicting, and I have not -- and I  
3 have searched and I haven't -- have seen no  
4 plaintiffs' witnesses identify any studies that  
5 tobacco companies identify are addicting. That's  
6 the no evidence.  
7 Q. Surely somebody who would listen to you  
8 might, might believe that there are no studies in  
9 the world. Could they maybe get that inference from



10 that sentence?  
11 MR. WITTMANN:  
12 Objection, Your Honor.  
13 Argumentative.  
14 MR. SCHNEIDER:  
15 Objection, Your Honor.  
16 THE COURT:  
17 Sustained.  
18 Don't answer that question.  
19 Next question.  
20 EXAMINATION BY MR. BRUNO:  
21 Q. Let's be clear, Doctor. You told this jury  
22 that when you were undertaking to find all of the  
23 articles on nicotine, you did the search yourself,  
24 right?  
25 A. Right.  
26 Q. When it came to this business of the  
27 existence or nonexistence of studies, you relied on  
28 the cigarette company lawyers to identify the  
29 documents for your review; isn't that true?  
30 A. Not entirely, no. I did some searches of  
31 literature myself, tobacco company documents.  
32 Q. And those were documents where?  
HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753  
19244  
1 A. There's a website, tobacco resolution  
2 website, and I searched that website to see if there  
3 were documents that I was not seeing that provided  
4 some evidence that, well, for all of the things I've  
5 talked about. So, I did some studies.  
6 Q. Do you know where the documents in the  
7 tobacco company websites come from?  
8 A. No.  
9 Q. No. Okay. Did you ask anybody?  
10 A. No.  
11 Q. No. Dang. Okay. Well, let's assume that  
12 this box -- let's assume, just for the fun of it,  
13 that this box -- see, I've got RJR -- Reynolds on  
14 one side -- I lost my little holder. It's on my  
15 tie. Okay.  
16 Let's assume -- see, I've got this box, and  
17 I've got Lorillard on one side of the box and I've  
18 got Philip Morris on one side of the box and I've  
19 got Brown and Williamson on one side of the box and  
20 I've got R.J. Reynolds. Okay. Let's assume that  
21 this box contains all of the information that these  
22 four companies know about with regard to nicotine.  
23 Okay?  
24 A. (Nods head affirmatively.)  
25 Q. Can we do that?  
26 A. Yes. That's not a very good assumption,  
27 but --  
28 Q. It's not?  
29 A. Not because -- only because I've seen the  
30 boxes, and that box wouldn't begin to hold the  
31 number of documents that --  
32 Q. Let's assume --  
HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753  
19245  
1 A. We can assume that.  
2 Q. Let's assume it's a really big box I've

3 shrunk with my magic machine.  
4 A. Okay.  
5 Q. Do you understand that when a person files a  
6 lawsuit, they get to ask the other side to produce  
7 documents? You understand that?  
8 MR. WITTMANN:  
9 Objection, Your Honor. May we approach?  
10 THE COURT:  
11 Yes.  
12 (Whereupon, a sidebar conference is held  
13 as follows:)  
14 MR. WITTMANN:  
15 Your Honor, these questions don't go to  
16 this witness' expert qualifications. He's  
17 asking us to assume things. He's getting  
18 into substantive questioning. I don't know  
19 what he's doing. It's not qualifications.  
20 MR. BRUNO:  
21 This is methodology. I will demonstrate  
22 this witness' methodology -- once again, look  
23 again, he says "no evidence in the world."  
24 His methodology was he let the defendants  
25 give him the documents.  
26 THE COURT:  
27 I will give you some latitude.  
28 The objection at this point is  
29 overruled.  
30 Try to keep your questions limited to  
31 that.  
32 MR. SCHNEIDER:

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19246

1 He's attacking methodology a la Daubert.  
2 That should be done at another time.  
3 THE COURT:  
4 If this becomes a Daubert hearing, I'll  
5 stop it.  
6 (End of sidebar.)  
7 EXAMINATION BY MR. BRUNO:  
8 Q. You know, let me back up a little bit. You  
9 made the comparison between all of the articles in  
10 the world on nicotine and you compared that to some  
11 documents that the defense lawyers had you look at,  
12 right?  
13 A. Yes.  
14 Q. Now, I just want to make sure that the jury  
15 and we all understand where the documents came from.  
16 The plaintiff, when he files a lawsuit, can ask the  
17 defendant to produce documents. You understand  
18 that?  
19 A. Yes.  
20 Q. And the defendant, their lawyers can object  
21 or they can produce documents and if there's an  
22 objection, the Judge will rule, sometimes the  
23 document's produced and sometimes they're not. You  
24 know that?  
25 A. I guess that's right.  
26 Q. Let's assume that these are the documents  
27 that got produced. Now, those are the documents  
28 that the plaintiff lawyers have access to, right?  
29 A. I assume so, yes.  
30 Q. These are the documents that are also on

31 those websites, right?  
32 A. I don't know where the documents on the  
HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753  
19247

1 website came from. There may be more on there or  
2 less. I don't know.

3 Q. Would you take my word for it the documents  
4 on the website are documents produced in the  
5 litigation.

6 A. I'll take your word for it.

7 Q. Now, did you ask any of the defendant  
8 cigarette companies to let you go to their offices  
9 and look at the documents that they didn't produce?

10 A. I made --

11 MR. LONG:

12 Objection, Your Honor. May I approach?

13 THE COURT:

14 Yes.

15 (Whereupon, a sidebar conference is held  
16 as follows:)

17 MR. LONG:

18 Mr. Bruno, his questions seem to try to  
19 create the impression that there are  
20 documents that our clients have, the law  
21 firms have, that haven't been produced in  
22 litigation. The witness doesn't know that.  
23 It's not fair to ask him to assume that.  
24 Every document requested in this case was  
25 produced. If we objected to it, we had a  
26 hearing or not. There's no evidence that  
27 there's any documents relating to nicotine  
28 that haven't been produced.

29 MR. BRUNO:

30 That's not the question.

31 THE COURT:

32 The question was did you go to the  
HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753  
19248

1 tobacco companies and ask them to let you  
2 look at the documents they didn't produce.

3 MR. BRUNO:

4 Right.

5 THE COURT:

6 It presumes as a fact that there are  
7 some documents they didn't produce, and I  
8 think that's Mr. Long's contention. That's  
9 not in evidence.

10 MR. BRUNO:

11 If he's suggesting that I meant broke  
12 the law and didn't produce, I meant there  
13 could be many documents that were not the  
14 subject of an appropriate discovery request.

15 THE COURT:

16 His statement was that whatever was  
17 requested to be produced, it was produced or  
18 it was ruled they didn't have to produce it.  
19 The implication in your question is that  
20 there's some that they didn't produce, and  
21 that's inappropriate.

22 MR. BRUNO:

23 There may be some documents they didn't

24 produce. How do we know?  
25 THE COURT:  
26 You're asking him to assume that as a  
27 fact. That's not in evidence.  
28 MR. BRUNO:  
29 I'll withdraw the question and change  
30 it.  
31 MR. LONG:  
32 The inference is there are documents  
HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753  
19249  
1 relative to the issue of nicotine that the  
2 companies didn't produce. There is  
3 absolutely no evidence of that and it creates  
4 a false impression.  
5 MR. BRUNO:  
6 The burden is on this witness to --  
7 MR. LONG:  
8 How does he know that?  
9 MR. BRUNO:  
10 As an expert witness, he has to conduct  
11 the inquiry.  
12 THE COURT:  
13 The inference of your question is  
14 inappropriate.  
15 MR. BRUNO:  
16 I will withdraw the objection and change  
17 it.  
18 THE COURT:  
19 I will maintain the objection and  
20 instruct the jury to disregard the question.  
21 (End of sidebar.)  
22 THE COURT:  
23 The objection is sustained.  
24 Disregard that question.  
25 Next question.  
26 EXAMINATION BY MR. BRUNO:  
27 Q. Did you go to the cigarette companies and did  
28 you ask to see their documents?  
29 A. Well, I've never conducted business directly  
30 with the cigarette companies, first of all, with the  
31 firms that represent them, but in the few cases, I  
32 did read in company documents that I was provided  
HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753  
19250  
1 some references to documents that I didn't remember  
2 seeing, and I asked for those to be provided.  
3 Q. We made a deal, Doc. The deal was you would  
4 answer my question, and if you wanted to explain,  
5 you could. I will ask you one more time. Did you  
6 go to the cigarette companies and ask them if you  
7 could see their documents?  
8 MR. SCHNEIDER:  
9 Objection.  
10 A. No.  
11 MR. SCHNEIDER:  
12 Asked and answered, Your Honor.  
13 MR. BRUNO:  
14 Well, now, I've got an answer, so --  
15 THE COURT:  
16 Well, the objection is moot because he

17 answered your question.  
18 EXAMINATION BY MR. BRUNO:  
19 Q. Did you ask the cigarette companies if you  
20 could go talk to their scientists about what they  
21 knew or didn't know about nicotine?  
22 A. No, I have not talked to the cigarette  
23 companies.  
24 Q. At all?  
25 A. No.  
26 Q. Did you ask the lawyers to ask the companies?  
27 A. If I could talk to their scientists?  
28 Q. Yeah.  
29 A. No, because I've talked to their scientists  
30 at scientific meetings before, but I did not ask the  
31 defense if I could talk to their scientists.  
32 Q. Did you believe it would be an appropriate  
HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19251

1 scientific inquiry to go and learn whether or not  
2 there was information that might exist that wasn't  
3 produced in litigation that you might want to  
4 evaluate in order to make the statement that you  
5 make in your report?  
6 MR. LONG:  
7 Same objection, Your Honor.  
8 THE COURT:  
9 Overruled.  
10 Answer the question if you're able to.  
11 A. Okay. I do not believe that I have any  
12 better ability to rummage around through the tobacco  
13 company documents than the plaintiffs' lawyers. So,  
14 I did not think it was -- I would be able to uncover  
15 new information if it was available, and if it was  
16 able to be produced by myself. So, I have not asked  
17 to do that.

18 EXAMINATION BY MR. BRUNO:  
19 Q. That's fair, Doctor, but wouldn't it be more  
20 appropriate then to tell the jury after reviewing  
21 the documents that the defense lawyers picked out of  
22 what the plaintiff lawyers looked at after getting  
23 discovery, I made these conclusions? Wouldn't that  
24 be a more fair thing to tell the jury?

25 MR. SCHNEIDER:  
26 Objection, Your Honor.  
27 May we approach?  
28 THE COURT:  
29 Yes.  
30 (Whereupon, a sidebar conference is held  
31 as follows:)

32 THE COURT:  
HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753  
19252

1 Mr. Schneider?  
2 MR. SCHNEIDER:  
3 Yes. My objection is the question is  
4 contrary to the record. It's exactly what  
5 the witness did tell the jury, that he  
6 reviewed documents that were selected by the  
7 plaintiffs, and to make that question as if  
8 he said something different is objectionable.  
9 MR. BRUNO:

10 Except I was referring to the report  
11 sentence, Mr. Schneider. I wasn't referring  
12 to what he told -- asked him on direct.  
13 MR. SCHNEIDER:  
14 That report was never given to the jury  
15 by him at any time. You put it up.  
16 MR. BRUNO:  
17 I know. So, I'm still asking the  
18 question about the report. Is it wrong?  
19 THE COURT:  
20 The objection is overruled.  
21 (End of sidebar.)  
22 THE COURT:  
23 The objection is overruled.  
24 Answer the question if you're able to.  
25 Do you remember the question or you want  
26 it read back?  
27 THE WITNESS:  
28 Would you read it back, please?  
29 THE COURT:  
30 Wouldn't it be more appropriate then to  
31 tell the jury after reviewing the documents  
32 that the defense lawyers picked out of what  
HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19253

1 the plaintiffs' lawyers looked at after  
2 getting discovery I made these conclusions?  
3 Wouldn't that be a more fair thing to tell  
4 the jury?  
5 A. That would be a better representation of what  
6 that statement should have said. I should probably  
7 have better stated there is no evidence that I'm  
8 aware of or that I have seen that studies conducted  
9 by the tobacco industry demonstrate that nicotine is  
10 addictive.  
11 EXAMINATION BY MR. BRUNO:  
12 Q. Thank you very much, Doctor. I just have a  
13 few more questions.  
14 Do you understand that the plaintiff lawyers  
15 in this case had any opportunity to, quote, rummage  
16 through the defendants' documents?  
17 A. I don't know how they are able to obtain the  
18 documents.  
19 Q. All right. That's fine. Now, you've already  
20 testified, I believe, that a good part of your work  
21 was funded by something called the Tobacco -- I'm  
22 sorry -- the Kentucky Tobacco Health and Research --  
23 say it to me again. They've changed their name.  
24 I'm getting confused. What's the old name?  
25 A. The name that I know it under is Kentucky  
26 Tobacco and Health Research Institute.  
27 Q. They've changed their name, haven't they?  
28 A. I wasn't aware of that.  
29 Q. I went on the website last night. It's  
30 Kentucky Tobacco Research and Development Center  
31 now. That surprise you that they changed their  
32 name?

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19254

1 A. No, it's not.  
2 Q. This is also funded by the dedicated tax on

3 cigarettes in Kentucky?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. I was curious if you understand that this is  
6 the mission of that entity, old name or new name?  
7 It says here:

8 "The Kentucky Tobacco Research and  
9 Development Center conducts and supports  
10 unique research programs that examine new  
11 agricultural crop opportunities based upon  
12 tobacco and other plants."

13 It says: "The center's research  
14 projects explore the development and use of  
15 tobacco as a production system for plant-made  
16 pharmaceuticals and the discovery of new  
17 plant natural products having potential for  
18 commercialization. The Kentucky Tobacco  
19 Research and Development Center program  
20 emphasizes applications oriented research  
21 design to facilitate the development of new  
22 crop-based businesses and technologies for  
23 Kentucky agriculture."

24 Would you agree that that's the mission  
25 of these entities that funded most of your work?

26 MR. WITTMANN:

27 Objection, Your Honor. Hearsay. May I  
28 approach?

29 THE COURT:

30 Yeah.

31 (Whereupon, a sidebar conference is held  
32 as follows:)

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19255

1 MR. WITTMANN:

2 Again, Your Honor, I don't think that  
3 Mr. Bruno can just get up and start reading  
4 from a hearsay document not in evidence in  
5 the form of a question. I think that's  
6 improper examination.

7 MR. BRUNO:

8 He gets to tell me no if he doesn't get  
9 it or doesn't understand it or that I'm  
10 saying something incorrect.

11 MR. WITTMANN:

12 I don't think you get to read from a  
13 document at all unless you establish that the  
14 witness knows it's there. Reading from a  
15 document --

16 MR. BRUNO:

17 I can't possibly memorize the mission  
18 statement of this entity.

19 MR. WITTMANN:

20 I don't care if you memorize it or not.  
21 You couldn't state it if you didn't have the  
22 document.

23 MR. BRUNO:

24 Yes, I could. I could say, is the  
25 mission statement of X Y?

26 MR. WITTMANN:

27 That isn't what you did. You started  
28 reading from it to give it evidentiary  
29 weight.

30 MR. BRUNO:

31 So, I take it and write it down on  
32 another sheet of paper?  
HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753  
19256

1 MR. WITTMANN:  
2 Right.  
3 THE COURT:  
4 The objection is sustained.  
5 I'm going to instruct him not to answer  
6 the question.  
7 (End of sidebar.)  
8 THE COURT:  
9 Objection sustained.  
10 Next question, please.

11 EXAMINATION BY MR. BRUNO:

12 Q. Doctor, can you tell the jury what the  
13 mission is of the entity that funded most of your  
14 research?

15 A. The mission of the Kentucky Tobacco and  
16 Health Research Institute was to study the effects  
17 of tobacco and nicotine and different  
18 pharmacological and other effects. They have in the  
19 last three or four years, as the name implies -- I  
20 wasn't exactly sure they had changed their name, but  
21 I knew they had changed their mission, they had  
22 shifted their emphasis now to try to find  
23 alternative for the farmers of Kentucky for rather  
24 than producing tobacco for cigarette manufacture to  
25 use the tobacco plant for pharmaceutical purposes,  
26 for genetic manipulation. That is reflected in the  
27 new mission statement, which was not the mission  
28 when I was applying for funding.

29 Q. Right.

30 A. They do not support neuropharmacological  
31 research anymore because the new mission, as you  
32 said, is really more of a development process. So,  
HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19257

1 the mission is not -- that you read is not the  
2 mission that it was when I was being funded.

3 Q. So, when you were being funded, the mission  
4 was to study tobacco and health?

5 A. It was to study the pharmacological basis of  
6 tobacco and health, basically, and other aspects.  
7 They didn't study -- they didn't do anything with  
8 cancer research or anything like that. It was other  
9 aspects of tobacco.

10 Q. To what end?

11 A. To discover more -- I think the end result  
12 was to try to determine what were the harmful  
13 effects of tobacco and what were the good effects of  
14 tobacco. I mean, the whole thing was to try to  
15 support Kentucky tobacco, which is a major crop in  
16 Kentucky, and that was the end, to try to find  
17 research that would help the tobacco farmers. And  
18 the new mission that you read is to try to do that  
19 in a little bit different way.

20 Q. Right. You're there, Doc. The bottom line  
21 is the fact the mission of this entity was to help  
22 the tobacco farmers, right?

23 A. To protect these little, you know, family



24 farms that grow tobacco, right.  
25 Q. If you weren't making cigarettes, there would  
26 be no need to grow tobacco, right?  
27 A. Well, that's the new mission, is to try to  
28 find ways to continue the tobacco crop -- because it  
29 is kind of a unique plant and it does have the  
30 ability to -- you can genetically manipulate tobacco  
31 to make pharmaceutical products. That's the new  
32 emphasis.

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19258

1 Q. Do you think an entity that's devoted to  
2 protecting the tobacco farmer and his way of life  
3 would be terribly interested in doing research that  
4 might show that cigarette smoking is something  
5 really, really, really bad for you?

6 A. Yes. I think any knowledge that came out of  
7 that research could be useful for, perhaps, making  
8 people who are going to continue to smoke less  
9 susceptible to the health hazards of cigarette  
10 smoking.

11 MR. BRUNO:

12 Thank you so much, Doctor, for allowing  
13 me to cross-examine you on your  
14 qualifications. I really appreciate it.

15 THE COURT:

16 Redirect on qualifications?

17 MR. SCHNEIDER:

18 Yes.

19 RE-DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. SCHNEIDER:

20 Q. Dr. Rowell, Mr. Bruno was questioning you on  
21 your various opinions. Have you given any opinions  
22 to the jury yet?

23 A. I don't believe so, not really, no. Talked  
24 about what I'm going to talk about.

25 Q. All right. You talked about first being  
26 retained as an expert consultant, and you eventually  
27 learned that the lawyers that were retaining you  
28 were working for tobacco defendants, correct?

29 A. That's correct.

30 Q. Did that knowledge in any way affect the work  
31 that you did?

32 A. Not at all.

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19259

1 Q. Did it affect in any way the completeness of  
2 your literature search?

3 A. No.

4 Q. Now, Dr. Rowell, are you here to tell the  
5 jury that it is inappropriate to call cigarette  
6 smoking an addiction?

7 A. My opinion as a pharmacologist is that that  
8 is inappropriate because I think of an addiction as  
9 what substance or drug is the person addicted to, as  
10 a drug addiction.

11 Q. But if the definition of addiction is the  
12 addiction -- the definition that the United States  
13 Surgeon General adopted in 1988, and the cigarette  
14 companies have adopted that definition, are you here  
15 to disagree with that statement?

16 A. In part, I am, because the Surgeon General's

17 1988 report classified cigarette smoking addiction  
18 as compulsive drug use and not compulsive cigarette  
19 smoking behavior. Had they done that, I would have  
20 no objection to it, but I do not agree that  
21 cigarette smoking is a drug addiction.  
22 Q. All right. With respect to cigarette smoking  
23 behavior, the behavior of smoking, you think that  
24 can be labeled under some definitions as an  
25 addiction?  
26 A. Sure, under commonly used definitions, people  
27 talk about cigarette smoking addictions, and I don't  
28 have a quibble with that.  
29 Q. Today in giving your opinion, Doctor, are you  
30 going to focus on comparing nicotine and the effects  
31 of nicotine to the effects of other drugs, like  
32 cocaine and heroin?

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19260

1 A. Yes. That would be a fundamental part of my  
2 testimony.  
3 Q. And is that a topic that you have studied for  
4 30 years?  
5 A. Yes.  
6 Q. Is that a topic upon which you have written  
7 peer-reviewed articles during the course of your  
8 career?  
9 A. Yes.  
10 Q. With respect to the funding of your research  
11 by the Kentucky Tobacco and Health Institute, did  
12 you submit to them proposals for research on the  
13 pharmacology of nicotine?  
14 A. Yes.  
15 Q. And were those proposals funded by that  
16 institution?  
17 A. Yes, they were.

18 MR. SCHNEIDER:  
19 Thank you, Doctor. I would submit him  
20 on his qualifications, Your Honor.  
21 THE COURT:  
22 Objections to the tender?  
23 MR. BRUNO:  
24 May I have a moment, Judge, please?  
25 Judge, I will confess to you that this  
26 is a new one. I've never been in a trial  
27 where an expert was tendered to contradict --  
28 THE COURT:  
29 Approach the bench, please.  
30 MR. WITTMANN:  
31 Your Honor --  
32 THE COURT:

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19261

1 Approach the bench, please.  
2 (Whereupon, a sidebar conference is held  
3 as follows:)  
4 MR. BRUNO:  
5 Should I give my objection at sidebar?  
6 THE COURT:  
7 No.  
8 MR. WITTMANN:  
9 Mr. Bruno cannot resist making

10 statements that he shouldn't be making in  
11 front of the jury despite your repeatedly  
12 telling him not to.  
13 THE COURT:  
14 I asked if he had any objections. He  
15 talked to Mr. Herman and he started, I guess,  
16 making an objection. I think it's  
17 appropriate that I hear the objections and  
18 the arguments outside of the hearing of the  
19 jury. We will do that right now.  
20 I will dismiss the jury for the day and  
21 hear the objections and I'll rule.  
22 MR. BRUNO:  
23 Thank you, Judge.  
24 (End of sidebar.)  
25 THE COURT:  
26 The arguments on whether or not this  
27 gentleman should be qualified as an expert  
28 are going to take place out of your presence.  
29 It's not necessary that you hear it. We will  
30 recess for today, until tomorrow morning, and  
31 let's be on time tomorrow, everybody. Thank  
32 you. Both at 9:30 and at 1:30.

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19262

1 (Jury excused.)  
2 MR. BRUNO:  
3 Judge, before I make my argument, may I  
4 put some -- I'd like to put some things in  
5 evidence in connection with --  
6 THE COURT:  
7 If you'll allow me to get things on the  
8 record since the jury has left, then, we'll  
9 do some other things.  
10 The jury has left the courtroom.  
11 Anything for the record by plaintiffs'  
12 counsel other than having to do with the  
13 tender of Dr. Rowell as an expert?  
14 MR. RUSS HERMAN:  
15 I heard the last --  
16 MR. BRUNO:  
17 Other than --  
18 MR. RUSS HERMAN:  
19 We had one other issue, but I could wait  
20 for that.  
21 THE COURT:  
22 Defense Counsel anything for the record?  
23 MR. WITTMANN:  
24 Yes, Your Honor. Mr. Bruno repeatedly  
25 says things in front of this jury that he  
26 shouldn't be saying and he knows he shouldn't  
27 be making them. "In all of my years of an  
28 attorney" -- an objection was made -- that's  
29 not proper conduct in view of Your Honor's  
30 orders and we would request Your Honor again  
31 on the record to instruct Mr. Bruno not to do  
32 that again.

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19263

1 MR. RUSS HERMAN:  
2 Your Honor, can we ask the witness to be

3 excused?  
4 THE COURT:  
5 You are admonished to that effect, Mr.  
6 Bruno.  
7 MR. BRUNO:  
8 Yes, Your Honor.  
9 THE COURT:  
10 Please step out of the courtroom.  
11 THE WITNESS:  
12 Certainly.  
13 (Witness excused.)  
14 THE COURT:  
15 Objections to the tender, Mr. Bruno.  
16 Mr. Bruno, if you wish to object to the  
17 tender, it's time to do so.  
18 MR. BRUNO:  
19 Yes. Judge, in connection with our  
20 opposition, I'd like to offer and introduced  
21 the following documents into the record. The  
22 first, Judge, is Page -- Transcript Page  
23 1,366 of this record, which contains the  
24 sentence uttered by Mr. Long: "We agree  
25 cigarette smoking can be considered  
26 addictive."  
27 Second thing I'd like to offer into  
28 evidence is the Scott Plaintiffs' Exhibit  
29 Number 1882.01, which is the Brown and  
30 Williamson company website wherein they make  
31 the statement: "Brown and Williamson agrees  
32 that by current definitions of the term

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19264

1 addiction, including that of the Surgeon  
2 General in 1988, cigarette smoking is  
3 addictive."  
4 Also offer response of Brown and  
5 Williamson to Plaintiffs' First Request for  
6 Admissions Regarding Merits Directed to All  
7 Defendants. It is Scott Plaintiffs' Exhibit  
8 Number 1961.01, specifically, Judge, at  
9 Request Number 23, which is admitted, deny  
10 cigarette smoking is addictive?  
11 Answer: "Brown and Williamson  
12 recognizes that by most current definitions  
13 of the term addiction, including that of the  
14 Surgeon General in 1988, cigarette smoking  
15 can be classified as addictive. We agree  
16 that cigarette smoking is addictive in the  
17 sense that the term is applied in common,  
18 everyday usage."  
19 Also introduce Philip Morris website  
20 Plaintiffs' Exhibit Number 3115.02, wherein  
21 it is stated: "We agree with the  
22 overwhelming medical and scientific consensus  
23 that cigarette smoking is addictive."  
24 Also Philip Morris's Response to  
25 Plaintiffs' First Request for Admissions  
26 Regarding Merits Directed to All Defendants.  
27 It is Exhibit Number 806.01, specifically,  
28 Number 27, admit or deny that cigarette  
29 smoking is addictive. Response, Philip  
30 Morris admits this request.

31 Also RJR website Exhibit Number 4741.01,  
32 wherein R.J. Reynolds make the statement:  
HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753  
19265

1 "Many people believe that smoking is  
2 addictive and as that term is commonly used  
3 today, it is."

4 Also the R.J. Reynolds company  
5 response -- I'm sorry -- response of R.J.  
6 Reynolds Tobacco Company to Plaintiffs' First  
7 Request for Admissions Regarding Merits  
8 Directed to All Defendants. It is Scott  
9 Exhibit 4780.01, Request Number 23, admit or  
10 deny cigarette smoking is addictive.  
11 Reynolds states that many people believe that  
12 cigarette smoking is addictive and as that  
13 term is commonly used today, i.e., to  
14 describe behavior that is difficult to quit,  
15 close paren, it is.

16 Finally, Scott Exhibit Number 2871.02,  
17 which is the Lorillard Tobacco Company's  
18 Response to Plaintiffs' First Request for  
19 Admissions Regarding Merits Directed to All  
20 Defendants at Request Number 23:

21 "Admit or deny that cigarette smoking is  
22 addictive."

23 Response: "Lorillard, however, believes  
24 that smokers can reach a decision to stop  
25 smoking subject to and without waiving the  
26 general objections stated above, Lorillard  
27 admits that cigarette smoking can be  
28 addictive."

29 Now, Judge, it's -- despite learned  
30 Counsel's attempt to elicit from the witness  
31 in the last few moments before the jury was  
32 discharged an opinion that he was not going

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753  
19266

1 to disagree with the '88 Surgeon General's  
2 Report, the witness said that he did. The  
3 fact of the matter is that under 401, 402,  
4 403, there is a discussion of relevant  
5 evidence. In this case, the defendants,  
6 through their websites, which affirmatively  
7 state their position on addiction, through  
8 their response to requests for admissions,  
9 have stated that they agree that cigarette  
10 smoking is addictive. Judge, once they  
11 respond to a request for admission on that  
12 point, that issue is out of the case. It's  
13 gone. 402 says -- 401 says:

14 "Relevant evidence means evidence having  
15 any tendency to make the existence of any  
16 fact that is of consequence to the  
17 determination of the action more probable or  
18 less probable than it would be without the  
19 evidence."

20 Now, in this case, to the extent that  
21 the jury is going to be asked that question,  
22 the defendants have admitted it, that there's  
23 nothing whatsoever that this witness'

24 testimony on the subject of addiction can add  
25 to the resolution of that issue either way.  
26 402 says to the extent it is not  
27 relevant, it is not admissible. It doesn't  
28 come in.

29 We respectfully suggest, Judge, that any  
30 testimony by this witness that would suggest  
31 in any way that cigarette smoking is not  
32 addictive is not an opinion that he should be

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19267

1 permitted to make under 401 and 402 of the  
2 Code of Evidence.

3 With regard to his opinion relative to  
4 his comparison between what's known in the  
5 world about nicotine and its properties  
6 versus what the cigarette companies know, it  
7 has been demonstrated without question that  
8 he did not appropriately make the necessary  
9 scientific inquiry to reach that conclusion.  
10 He admits that he relied on the defense  
11 lawyers to select the documents for his  
12 review. He admitted, when I asked him the  
13 same question with regard to his efforts to  
14 uncover all of the articles in the world  
15 about addiction, that he would not have  
16 accepted that same assistance from defense  
17 counsel because it wouldn't have been a  
18 legitimate scientific inquiry.

19 As such, any opinion that he has about  
20 what the cigarette companies knew relative to  
21 what was extant in the published world about  
22 nicotine addiction should be excluded on that  
23 basis.

24 Finally, the witness has testified that  
25 he is -- all of the body of his knowledge is  
26 based upon animal studies and, as such, all  
27 of his opinions should be limited to the  
28 effect of nicotine on animals. He admits  
29 that he has done no studies on human beings.  
30 The best thing that he could tell this jury  
31 in the tender was that he had read articles  
32 by others on that subject and was prepared to

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19268

1 give an opinion based upon his review of  
2 those articles.

3 With that, Judge, we respectfully  
4 suggest that this witness' tender and his  
5 examination should be so limited.

6 THE COURT:

7 You object to his tender as an expert in  
8 nicotine pharmacology?

9 MR. BRUNO:

10 Only as it relates to animals. I'm  
11 sorry. We agree he is an expert in nicotine  
12 pharmacology as it relates to animals, not  
13 humans.

14 THE COURT:

15 You object to his tender as an expert  
16 with regard to the effects of nicotine on the

17 body?  
18 MR. BRUNO:  
19 Yes. The human body.  
20 THE COURT:  
21 Do you object to his tender as an expert  
22 with regard to nicotine's relation to smoking  
23 behavior and addiction or dependence?  
24 MR. BRUNO:  
25 We object to the -- he testified, Judge,  
26 I believe, that he is not an expert on  
27 smoking behavior, that is, the behavior of  
28 individuals who smoke in the absence of the  
29 pharmacological component.

30 THE COURT:  
31 He was tendered as an expert in the  
32 field of nicotine pharmacology, the effect of  
HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753  
19269

1 nicotine on the body, its relation to smoking  
2 behavior and addiction or dependence.  
3 MR. BRUNO:  
4 We believe he's demonstrated quite  
5 clearly that he has nothing to offer on the  
6 issue of addiction and, therefore, we object  
7 to his tender on that subject.

8 THE COURT:  
9 And the last area in which he was  
10 tendered as an expert is historical knowledge  
11 of nicotine and its actions.

12 Do you object to his tender as an expert  
13 in that field?

14 MR. BRUNO:  
15 We don't object, Judge, that he has done  
16 this historical review of nicotine and its  
17 actions. Our problem is his attempt to  
18 compare that to what cigarette companies  
19 knew. So, this is not an objection to the  
20 tender. Rather, it's a motion to limit his  
21 testimony that he should be prohibited from  
22 making any comment whatsoever on what the  
23 cigarette companies knew.

24 THE COURT:  
25 Well, the historical knowledge possessor  
26 is not identified in the tender. It's not a  
27 tender of -- expert in the historical  
28 knowledge of --

29 MR. BRUNO:  
30 You are right.

31 THE COURT:  
32 -- certain parties or excluding certain  
HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753  
19270

1 parties. It's general. That's my question  
2 to you. Do you object to that tender?

3 MR. BRUNO:  
4 Yes, I do, precisely because, you remind  
5 me, it is far more inclusive than one would  
6 believe.

7 THE COURT:  
8 Response?

9 MR. SCHNEIDER:

10 Yes, Your Honor. Just a couple of  
11 housekeeping matters first. The plaintiffs  
12 cited to the opening statement as remarks as  
13 evidence. They're not evidence. But the  
14 defendants in this case are not going to  
15 contest that you can call cigarette smoking  
16 addiction by the commonly used definition  
17 and, in fact, our websites say that and our  
18 requests for admissions say that. Dr.  
19 Rowell, I'm not going to elicit an opinion  
20 from him that cigarette smoking is not  
21 addictive. Instead, he is going to talk  
22 about nicotine pharmacology and compare the  
23 strength of nicotine, how nicotine acts in  
24 the body versus cocaine, heroin and other  
25 things. That's the things that he studied  
26 his entire career.

27 They say that his studies are based on  
28 animal research. In major part, it is.  
29 That's animal research cited by the Surgeon  
30 General in a report that concluded that  
31 nicotine was addictive in 1988. If it's good  
32 enough for the Surgeon General, it's good

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19271

1 enough for this jury and, in fact, the  
2 witness will testify that pharmacologists  
3 routinely rely on the results of animal  
4 studies because you can't put probes in the  
5 brains of human beings to measure dopamine  
6 levels. You have to draw inferences from  
7 animals. That's part of the opinions he will  
8 elicit.

9 Your Honor, he has not yet given his  
10 opinions to the jury. The plaintiffs have  
11 criticized his personal view on addiction,  
12 but I'm intending to elicit his testimony on  
13 three areas: Comparing how nicotine affects  
14 the body, how it works on nerves; talk about  
15 the effect, to compare that to other drugs,  
16 like cocaine, caffeine, morphine,  
17 amphetamine; and to compare the relative  
18 impact of nicotine being intravenously  
19 delivered to a person versus smoking behavior  
20 based on literature that he has reviewed as  
21 somebody who's worked as a pharmacologist for  
22 30 years and been funded by state agencies  
23 and by the federal government.

24 With respect to the historical knowledge  
25 of nicotine and its addiction, I mean the  
26 scientific historical knowledge of nicotine  
27 and its actions that's been published. With  
28 respect to the tobacco documents, the opinion  
29 to be elicited from Dr. Rowell is whether  
30 documents that the plaintiffs have pointed to  
31 as containing new scientific information, in  
32 fact, contain new scientific information, in

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19272

1 his opinion, based on the research that he  
2 has done.



3 Now, he has his own personal views about  
4 what should and should not be called  
5 addictive, and he is a scientist and  
6 respected scientist in that field. We're not  
7 going to elicit his opinions on whether we  
8 agree or disagree with his opinions on  
9 addiction. We are going to talk about the  
10 strength of nicotine and its role with  
11 respect to dependence, how -- whether  
12 nicotine interferes with a person's ability  
13 to quit. The plaintiffs themselves have  
14 called witnesses, Dr. Henningfield and Dr.  
15 Benowitz, who have talked about nicotine  
16 pharmacology. These witnesses have said that  
17 nicotine is like cocaine and heroin. These  
18 witnesses have said that nicotine has an  
19 effect on neurotransmitters. Well, this  
20 witness is going to address those fields.  
21 He's going to compare the relative  
22 contribution of nicotine versus other drugs  
23 and their effect on the body and his ultimate  
24 opinion is going to be that its  
25 pharmacological effects are far weaker than  
26 the effects noted for other drugs.  
27 Plaintiffs will try to compare it to cocaine  
28 and heroin, but we don't think it compares in  
29 that fashion.

30 He has -- this is a witness who has  
31 worked in the field for 30 years in nicotine  
32 pharmacology. He's published 30 peer-

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19273

1 reviewed articles, he has been cited by the  
2 U.S. Surgeon General and he is well qualified  
3 to talk about nicotine pharmacology and the  
4 results of animal studies.

5 The plaintiffs disagree with his view on  
6 what you can call addiction is totally beside  
7 the point and that's not an opinion we're  
8 going to elicit from him. We're not going to  
9 tell him, give us your personal opinions on  
10 what you should and should not call  
11 addictions.

12 For those reasons, Your Honor, we think  
13 he should be accepted as an expert in the  
14 field of nicotine pharmacology, he should be  
15 allowed to testify about the effect of  
16 nicotine on the body based on the research he  
17 has done and the animal research he has done.  
18 He should be allowed to talk about nicotine  
19 pharmacology and how that relates to smoking  
20 behavior and how it relates to addiction and  
21 dependence. He will testify that when you  
22 compare nicotine, cocaine, heroin, cocaine  
23 and heroin have far more of an addiction and  
24 dependence propensity than does nicotine.

25 With regard to the historical knowledge,  
26 Mr. Bruno admits he has surveyed the  
27 literature. That's what we were talking  
28 about there. When were certain findings made  
29 with respect to nicotine and the literature?  
30 With respect to tobacco documents, the sole

31 opinion I intend to elicit from him is to say  
32 has he been given documents that he  
HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19274

1 understands that plaintiffs in tobacco  
2 litigation contend show new tobacco -- new  
3 nicotine findings and do they, in fact, when  
4 you compare them to the historical  
5 literature, show a new finding.

6 So, Your Honor, for that reason, we  
7 would submit that he should be accepted.  
8 We're not -- again, we're not going to elicit  
9 his opinion on the ultimate issue of whether  
10 or not we can call cigarette smoking behavior  
11 and nicotine addictive.

12 THE COURT:

13 You wish to respond briefly, Mr. Bruno?

14 MR. BRUNO:

15 Very briefly. First, Judge,  
16 housekeeping. I'd like to also move for  
17 introduction the expert report of Peter  
18 Rowell, which, Judge, as you must know, is  
19 the only thing that guides us with regard to  
20 what this gentleman is going to talk about.

21 Secondly, in response to the opening  
22 statement, we don't offer it as a piece of  
23 evidence. We offer it as an admission of  
24 fact which Counsel made in opening statement,  
25 the same as the response to the request for  
26 admissions.

27 Finally, the biggest problem we have  
28 here, this is another example of the  
29 cigarette companies' creating an issue,  
30 providing expert testimony when none exists.  
31 This business of the comparison between  
32 cocaine and the other drugs is a comparison

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19275

1 relative to the difficulty that one has in  
2 quitting those drugs. This guy's -- I'm  
3 sorry -- this gentleman's opinion has been  
4 manufactured to talk about something that's  
5 not even in the case. This business of  
6 whether it's weak or rewarding as compared to  
7 other drugs is of absolutely no moment to  
8 this case. This jury is not going to be  
9 asked which is the more dependence producing,  
10 heroin or cigarette smoking. That's not in  
11 this case at all. That's a red herring. But  
12 the only opinion, if Your Honor reviews this  
13 report, that this witness can possibly  
14 testify to that's at all relevant to the case  
15 is that nicotine produces a rather mild  
16 degree of physical dependence. Everything  
17 else is not in this case.

18 I would invite Your Honor to review his  
19 report and conclusions in connection with our  
20 arguments. This doesn't have a number. I'll  
21 just give this -- it's been referred to --  
22 for purposes of the record, let's introduce  
23 this as PO Number 2.

24 THE COURT:  
25 Mr. Schneider, you wish to say  
26 something?  
27 MR. SCHNEIDER:  
28 Yes, briefly, Your Honor. I'm sure that  
29 Your Honor recalls that Dr. Henningfield and  
30 Dr. Benowitz talked about the effect of  
31 nicotine on the brain, talked about the  
32 neurotransmitters that nicotine triggers,  
HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753  
19276

1 talked about how nicotine operates like  
2 cocaine and like heroin and said that it was,  
3 in fact -- had greater interference with the  
4 ability to quit than did cocaine and  
5 heroin -- nicotine had a greater ability to  
6 interfere.  
7 Well, Dr. Rowell is going to address  
8 those topics. Dr. Rowell is going to testify  
9 how nicotine works in the nerve synapses.  
10 He's going to show how cocaine and the other  
11 drugs work in the nerve synapses.

12 THE COURT:  
13 You're repeating yourself.  
14 I will take the offer and objections  
15 under advisement. I will rule first thing in  
16 the morning.

17 Recess.

18 MR. RUSS HERMAN:  
19 May it please the court, Your Honor may  
20 not have to deal with this issue now, and I  
21 don't want to burden the Court with issues  
22 you don't have to deal with, but I was  
23 advised this morning that the Philip Morris  
24 expert and fact witness, Mr. Whidby, who is  
25 listed as a will-call witness, that Philip  
26 Morris, who Mr. Richardson declines to  
27 produce two trial transcripts. If they're  
28 not going to call Mr. Whidby next week, then,  
29 I don't have -- the Court doesn't have to  
30 deal with the issue right now. I had  
31 understood that the witness was being called  
32 next week was Townsend, not.

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753  
19277

1 MR. WITTMANN:  
2 Bee. Then, I heard after lunch that  
3 Whidby might be called next week. So, I need  
4 it clarified so we can get these issues  
5 resolved so we can get the transcripts.

6 MR. GAY:  
7 Whidby won't be called next week.  
8 There's some confidentiality with regard to  
9 these transcripts.

10 THE COURT:  
11 I've referred that matter to the Special  
12 Master. I understand it's come up before --  
13 similar situations have come up before, and  
14 there's a way to resolve them so that if the  
15 transcript of some testimony subject to a  
16 Protective Order issued by some other court

17 is an obstacle to producing that transcript,  
18 you and Mr. Herman, Mr. Gay, I presume, you  
19 will handle it. Discuss that with Mr.  
20 Gianna. If there's things that I need to  
21 resolve, I will resolve.

22 MR. GAY:

23 One other thing.

24 MR. BRUNO:

25 One quick thing, Your Honor. I made a  
26 mistake on the transcript page. Can I  
27 correct that now? I gave you the wrong  
28 number for the transcript page for the  
29 opening statement by Mr. Long.

30 THE COURT:

31 1,366.

32 MR. BRUNO:

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19278

1 Right. It is 11,366. I apologize.

2 THE COURT:

3 Mr. Gay, you have something else?

4 MR. GAY:

5 Yes. I had a question about the depo  
6 designation hearings that we need  
7 particularly on some Philip Morris  
8 depositions, Your Honor, for, perhaps this  
9 Thursday morning.

10 THE COURT:

11 Start again.

12 You have some questions about depo  
13 designation hearings?

14 MR. GAY:

15 Yes. I would like to try to get some  
16 times from the Court with respect to that.

17 THE COURT:

18 Well, what are you referring to, Mr.  
19 Gay? I have a letter from Mr. Copley dated  
20 April 23 that lists ten of them, three or  
21 four witnesses were scheduled for  
22 yesterday and I was told those issues were  
23 resolved. They include a person named  
24 Debethizy who is identified as a Philip  
25 Morris witness. There are seven others.  
26 You're shaking your head. I don't know what  
27 you mean when you're shaking your head. I'm  
28 looking at a letter that has ten listed on  
29 it. And five of them are identified as  
30 Philip Morris witnesses. Are you talking  
31 about a different list that I -- other than  
32 the one I'm talking about?

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19279

1 MR. GAY:

2 I don't have the list in front of me.  
3 The name you mentioned as a Philip Morris  
4 witness didn't sound like a Philip Morris  
5 witness to me, but maybe I just didn't hear  
6 it correctly.

7 THE COURT:

8 Well, let's start again.

9 MR. GAY:

10 All right.  
11 THE COURT:  
12 You want to talk about setting times for  
13 depo cut rules?  
14 MR. GAY:  
15 That's correct, Your Honor.  
16 THE COURT:  
17 Of depositions of whom? Do you know the  
18 names?  
19 MR. GAY:  
20 Yes, Your Honor, I do. Myron Johnson.  
21 THE COURT:  
22 He's on this list, Number 1, M. Johnson.  
23 MR. GAY:  
24 Kinser. Robin Kinser. Robin Kinser.  
25 THE COURT:  
26 That person is also on this list.  
27 MR. GAY:  
28 Okay. Those are the two I most want to  
29 get done sometime so we can have some --  
30 THE COURT:  
31 Well, you know that we worked for  
32 exactly five minutes yesterday and I was told  
HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19280

1 we have nothing else to do. We were there in  
2 the Gianna law firm offices, court reporter,  
3 lawyers, binders and we were going to do the  
4 depositions for G. Burger, D. Debethizy and  
5 A. Spears, and I was told, Judge, all of that  
6 has been resolved. Let's go home. And we  
7 did.

8 MR. GAY:  
9 Yeah, I heard that.  
10 THE COURT:  
11 And we wasted a day.  
12 MR. GAY:  
13 Very frustrating for us, too, Judge.  
14 THE COURT:  
15 I just wonder why no one brought that to  
16 my attention then and you're doing it now.

17 MR. GAY:  
18 I think the reason for that, Judge, was  
19 there was no availability for the people who  
20 were carrying the Philip Morris witnesses  
21 that day and that there had not been a chance  
22 to work out -- as of the last time that  
23 hearing was scheduled, the matters with  
24 respect to the deposition schedule for that  
25 day had not been resolved. At some point,  
26 they resolved them before the hearing.

27 THE COURT:  
28 My only point is, Mr. Gay, I know what I  
29 have to do. When I set aside time to do it,  
30 I really hate to waste that time by getting  
31 there at the appointed place and time and  
32 say, Judge, there's nothing to do, and then  
HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753

19281

1 the very next day be told that there's some  
2 urgency about some other stuff that, I

3 suppose, could have been done yesterday and  
4 we wouldn't be having this conversation  
5 today. That's my point.  
6 MR. GAY:  
7 I don't disagree with you.  
8 THE COURT:  
9 I don't know how to make it any clearer.  
10 I don't feel disposed to try to go into that  
11 issue at this point.  
12 I do remind you we have no testimony  
13 scheduled for the morning hours of May 1st.  
14 Maybe that will spark some ideas among the  
15 lawyers involved in this case.  
16 MR. GAY:  
17 That's what we're asking for, Judge.  
18 THE SPECIAL MASTER:  
19 He just said that's what we're asking  
20 for.  
21 THE COURT:  
22 I didn't hear that. I never heard that.  
23 Anything else before we adjourn?  
24 MR. BRUNO:  
25 I don't know if you received my motion  
26 to put those documents in evidence.  
27 THE COURT:  
28 I neglected to solicit objections. I  
29 will do that now.  
30 MR. SCHNEIDER:  
31 You're putting those documents into  
32 evidence on the objection to your tender, not  
HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753  
19282

1 09 trial --  
2 MR. BRUNO:  
3 That's correct.  
4 MR. SCHNEIDER:  
5 As evidence for Your Honor to consider  
6 and ruling on the tender, I don't have an  
7 objection to it, but not as trial exhibits.  
8 THE COURT:  
9 We'll recess until 9:30 tomorrow  
10 morning.  
11 (Whereupon, the proceedings are  
12 adjourned at 4:03 p.m.)  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31  
32

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753  
19283

1 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

HUFFMAN & ROBINSON, INC., CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS  
New Orleans, Louisiana (504) 525-1753